AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. IV.—(XXIV).—FEBRUARY, 1901.—NO. 2.

CHURCH BUILDING.—VIII.

Beauty in Religious Architecture.

THE architect who constructs a building has to proceed, first of all, in obedience to the physical and mechanical laws of stability and equilibrium. He conforms, furthermore, to the law of history, that is, to the architectural traditions of the past. His work is always inspired and shaped by the work of his predecessors. Even when most original, he is still chiefly an imitator, carrying out more or less consciously the forms and devices of the monuments and of the styles of architecture with which his observation and his studies have made him familiar.

It is in this manner that all the churches of this country have been built. No new style deserving the name has appeared among us. The extraordinary activity and fertility of the American mind which has endowed the world during the last fifty or sixty years with so many marvellous inventions, has accomplished little in the region of art. Much, indeed, abounded in the country of what generally leads to creative work in architecture: rapid growth of population creating fresh needs, new conditions calling for new adaptations, wealth, energy, self-reliance, and trust in the future. But other conditions no less essential were wanting: concentration of thought and of resources; patience to give art time to mature; above all, genius in the architects, and, in the public, that refined and cultivated taste which would appreciate and welcome only artistic work. Very few of our church builders have left a

name behind them, and about the only edifices that strike the tourist who visits America are those huge utilitarian structures which rise in our great cities floor above floor until the eye grows dizzy in striving to calculate their height. Yet here and there, if they look attentively, our visitors may notice structures obviously religious, with forms new and pleasing, a grouping of parts original and expressive, a free and intelligent handling of sculptural ornament; what, in short, might, under more favorable circumstances, develop into a really new style. Comparatively little of this has shown itself so far in our Catholic churches. There prevails a wholesome fear among us of departing from traditional forms, and doubtless we owe to it that we have escaped from setting before the public such lamentable structures as have been erected within the last fifty years for religious purposes by various Protestant denominations. But now that a class of well-trained architects have come to the front, there is less to fear in that regard, and henceforth we may look forward, if not to a new style, at least to a greater variety of forms and details, such as were common when architecture, instead of being a servile imitation of so-called models, had all the spontaneity and freedom of a living art.

But freedom in art is not to be understood as exemption from rule. Besides the above-mentioned laws, architecture is constrained like the other arts to submit to

The Law of Beauty.

The old Roman architect was mindful of this when he proclaimed that in a fine building, three things should always be found: stability, practical fitness, and beauty. *Haec autem fieri debent ut habeatur ratio utilitatis, firmitatis, venustatis.* Beauty, in fact, is an essential element in architecture. It is just what lifts its products from the sphere of mere usefulness into the higher region of art. Hence the constant concern of the architect is to infuse it as fully as possible into his work. He knows that, while stability is taken for granted, and convenience is looked for only by those who use the building, the general public expects that it shall be pleasing to the eye. Nor is the priest engaged in the

erection of a church less keenly alive to the fact. He, too, feels what is expected; not merely a solid commodious structure, but if possible something which his people, perhaps the whole town and surrounding country, may look up to with pride, or at the very least something upon which the eye may always rest with pleasure.

Beauty, that mysterious something in Nature and in art which reaches beyond the senses, and awakens in the soul a peculiar pleasurable emotion which cannot be described, but which in various shapes all have felt,—beauty is difficult to define, difficult to analyze. There is no room here for attempting to do either, so far as the general subject is concerned; but at least in the special domain of architecture, and in view of its application to our sacred edifices, we may try to determine, in some measure, what it is that awakens in us the sense of the beautiful. Only by some definite knowledge of this kind can the priest engaged in the work of planning and building anticipate with any assurance the result of certain proposed arrangements, or explain to himself and to others why certain aspects or features in the structure are pleasing or unpleasant.[1]

It has often been attempted to reduce the elements of the beautiful, in general, or in its leading forms, to some single principle or law, but the attempt has invariably failed. Beauty in architecture, as in all the other arts and in Nature itself, proceeds from a number of independent features which, to be properly understood, have to be considered separately. There are those among them whose presence may be little noticed, but whose absence is at once painfully felt, as would be the lack of rectitude in a line meant to be straight, or of regularity in a figure meant to be regular. These are the essential elements of beauty. Others, and among them those which afford most pleasure, may be wanting without being missed, and consequently may be called non-essential. We will deal briefly with both.

[1] The student of architecture may consult on the subject with equal profit and pleasure Fergusson's *History of Architecure: Introduction;* Ruskin's *Seven Lamps of Architecture,* and *The Stones of Venice;* Charles Blanc's *A Grammar of the Arts of Design,* Chap. Architecture.

ESSENTIAL LAWS OF BEAUTY.

Unity.—The first is unity. We cannot admire several things together. To enjoy them we must take them separately, or see them as joined together and forming a single though complex object. There are things we cannot unite thus; such, for example, as paintings in a picture gallery; others we can take in together, such as the leading features of a landscape, or of a building viewed inside or outside, or even a group of buildings. In a single building we look for unity of purpose and of general impression. It may be the impression of power and strength, or of grace and elegance, or any other of a pleasing kind. But once chosen it must not be counteracted by opposite effects.

This leads directly to unity or to harmony of style. Style is a language which, once chosen, as a mode of expression, must be adhered to from beginning to end. To use another comparison, the architect chooses his style as the painter chooses the tone of his picture and the scale of his colors. The selection once made, he cannot depart from it without spoiling his work. Even the uneducated eye turns away from certain incongruous architectural combinations,—churches begun in one style and finished in another,—classical decorations and Gothic altars.

Variety.—Unity, uniformity carried too far leads to monotony, and monotony is destructive of interest. Hence the need of a second, complemental element of beauty called variety. Variety is produced by multiplying the aspects of things. In architecture it breaks up the lines which otherwise would be unduly lengthened out; it fills the vacant surfaces with ornament. It introduces, without destroying the general effect, new features upon which the eye loves to dwell. In no style of architecture does this quality abound as in that of the Middle Ages. Its ever changing and ever striking outlines almost invariably give picturesqueness to Gothic churches, whilst the diversity of their decorative elements is endless. Though seemingly the same when seen together, each recess, each altar is different; each capital even has its individual character, a choice or an arrangement of leaf and flower all its own.

Symmetry.—Unity in any complex object is made sensible and

beautiful only by the symmetry or regular disposition and correspondence of its parts. Generally missing in inorganic nature, symmetry is the universal law of living organisms. The seed, the plant, the leaf, the flower may always be divided by a line into two parts that correspond to each other. The correspondence is still more perfect in the animal creation, and reaches its perfection in man. The law which God has thus followed in His work, man instinctively follows in his own creations. Almost every product of human industry is symmetrical; architectural work is pre-eminently so. The walls of a building have to be the same height at either side; the apertures, the supports of the same size and in equal number. If a feature of any kind is met on one side of a façade, such as a niche, a door, a window, something similar is expected on the other side. On and around the altar symmetry of the strictest kind has to prevail. All this the eye demands, irrespective of practical need or requirement. The law was less observed in Gothic architecture. It would sometimes seem as if the builder placed doors, windows, and all things else just where they were needed, without any thought of the effect; yet a closer examination will show that the different parts when not strictly corresponding were none the less happily balanced. It is chiefly in classical architecture that the rule is enforced, with the effect of supplying us with a number of sham doors and blind windows.

It will be asked how far the principle applies to towers and steeples.

If they occupy a central position in the front or in the transept, or if they are detached completely from the church, like the Italian *campanile*, obviously they do not call for a companion tower. In a certain number of churches, especially non-Catholic, in this country it has been possible to locate the tower outside these positions, yet so as not to require any corresponding structure. But when placed at one corner of the façade, as is commonly done, it imperatively demands at the other corner, either a like structure, or something similar, in order to restore the balance of the edifice. The rule followed in the great mediæval cathedrals was to flank the main entrance with two towers of equal importance. Sometimes one of the two was considerably smaller than the other, but this was owing to some interruption of the work followed by a

period of depression. Sometimes also it happened (and the case is common in our time), that a corner tower, with its spire, was raised high above the normal proportions. Standing by itself, far from depressing, it added dignity to the church, but it had to stand alone. Another of the same size would simply have crushed the edifice. Yet, as we have just said, something had to be introduced to balance the effect of the steeple placed all on one side. This was done, and continues to be done, by the erection on the opposite side of another, much inferior in height and in general proportions.

Proportion.—The next essential element of beauty is harmony of proportion, that is to say, a fitting relation of size between the different dimensions of any covered enclosure, or the various elements or parts of a building. The ultimate reason of this law is so subtile and complex that it escapes analysis; yet the law itself is in some measure present to every mind, and its neglect is at once noticed. A hall or a building is pronounced at first sight too low, or too high, or too narrow, even irrespective of its practical uses. A steeple is declared too small for a church, or an altar too large; why, it would often be impossible to say. There may be a conventional element in the judgment, people being generally disposed to look upon as correct what they have been accustomed to. But if, as happens here, the judgment is the same wherever civilization has refined men's tastes, it cannot be purely or even mainly conventional.

An interesting fact in connection with this law of proportion is that the development of any of the three dimensions detracts, to the eye, from the others. If we widen a church, for instance, without raising or lengthening it, it will look lower and shorter than before. If we narrow it, the opposite effect is felt. The obvious conclusion is that if the proportions in the original plan are correct, a change in any one of them must lead to a change in the others. Sometimes the architect will deliberately sacrifice two of the dimensions to emphasize the third. Breadth exteriorly conveys an impression of stability and repose. Depth within, with its receding lines, begets a sense of mystery. Great height lifts up the soul above earthly things. In his inability to reach all these effects except in a colossal structure, the architect may choose to emphasize any one of them; but this should never be

done to the extent of giving an unpleasant aspect to the others. In other words, the law of proportion possesses a certain amount of elasticity, within which the architect may freely move; but it has always to be respected in its essence.

It is not merely in the dimensions of a church, it is in all its parts that harmony of proportion should prevail. The nave, the aisles, the transept, the sanctuary—all have in some measure to correspond to one another in size. The towers and spires have to suit each other, and both must suit the church of which they are an appendage. If too small, they dishonor it; if too large, they crush it. The pillars, mouldings, ornaments of every kind, are subject to the same law. In a word, a building, a church is a sort of organic unity, like that of the human frame, demanding a regular correspondence of size in all its parts.

Stability.—Another essential element of architectural beauty is visible stability. We carry within us a sense, natural or cultivated, of the physical conditions necessary to secure solidity in a building, and we want, not merely to hope, or even to know, but to see with our eyes that they are present. A bulging wall, a leaning tower, are disquieting to look at, even when we know they are safe. A long wall that reveals nothing of its real strength is unsatisfactory. But let it be set visibly on a solid foundation, and divided by salient pilasters, at once the mind is reassured and satisfied. And so all over the structure, the eye instinctively seeks for proof that every element of stability is provided for, the foundations, if apparent, broad and strong, the walls sufficient to sustain the roof, the thrust of arches counteracted, their weight and their charge met by column or pier ascending from the ground to sustain them, or by brackets extending to them the strength of the wall in which they are imbedded.

But to give a building a monumental character, something more than visible stability is requisite; there must be a surplus of strength that ostensibly defies the ordinary causes of destruction and seems to promise endless duration. Yet such a quality may be pursued with too great expenditure, or at the cost of convenience, and thus become objectionable. The massiveness of the Romanesque and early Gothic churches has an effect of power and durability which is impressive, and which we can always

enjoy, because we do not use them aud have not to pay for them. If erected in our day we would call them perhaps heavy, inconvenient in many ways, and needlessly expensive.

Massiveness has its beauty, hut so has that **lightness of structure** which, without detriment, real or apparent, to solidity, covers a maximum of space with a minimum of materials and gives the building an airy, graceful, inviting look.

Truth.—The last essential condition of beauty in architecture is truth. Truth in architecture is much insisted upon in our day by the highest authorities. It may be understood in many ways. Negatively, it means the avoidance of deceit or disguise in the materials or in the structure; positively, it signifies a manner of construction which reveals distinctly the purpose of the building and what gives it fitness for its purpose. A church should look like a church, and like nothing else. It should suggest at the first glance the general character and the principal arrangements of its interior. It should create no expectations that are not fulfilled. The west front of the Cathedral of Strassburg suggests a nave thirty feet higher than the reality. The consequence is that, though beautiful in itself, the sight of it on entering is disappointing.

The most ordinary form of architectural deceit in our time consists in disguising the real nature of the materials and giving them the appearance of others more valuable. It may be said in a general way, that there is something unwelcome and unworthy in passing off as genuine what is only an imitation. Thus cheap imitations in furniture, in articles of dress or of adornment are universally objected to. They betray in people a wish to mislead the public and get credit for riches they do not possess. To offer them as a gift to anybody would be to deceive him or to imply that he is content with appearances, and thus would be rather an affront than a compliment. It follows that as a rule imitations are unsuitable as offerings to God. What is most beautiful and precious in the world is as nothing in His eyes; but if anything be welcome to Him, one would expect it to be the simple, undisguised offering of what His children honestly possess. A pretentious front to a private residence, unsustained by any other feature within or without, is most unpleasant to look at; how much more an ambitious façade to a church of which every detail

betrays the limited means of the builder! There is a simple dignity in the humblest habitation, if convenient and clean, as there may be in the plainest dress, if in keeping with the station of the wearer.

As a general principle this is obvious enough; the difficulty is to apply it judiciously, for even its most ardent supporters admit that it has its limitations. Thus the veneering of marble slabs which covers so many brick churches of central Italy cannot be called a deceit, since nobody supposes it to represent the real materials of the walls any more than the plaster that covers their interior. In general, wherever a coating of any kind is commonly employed to hide the roughness or poverty of the material, the structure may be of an inferior kind, but no objection can be raised against it in the name of truth, because no deceit is either meant or effected. Indeed little of that kind can be attempted externally except in mild climates. The alternating temperature and intense cold which prevail in most parts of this country practically forbid such devices on the outside.

But everywhere the interior of our churches offers a wide field for them, and the temptation is great to employ them. How natural, for instance, where marble altars, columns and balustrades cannot be afforded, to use wood which, carefully painted, and seen at a distance, may be made to look so like marble! But there is more. In our day it has been found possible by various compounds to imitate so perfectly the different kinds of marble, with their exquisite smoothness of surface and brightness, that when they are first set up only close inspection can reveal the difference. What a temptation to appeal to the imitation when the genuine article cannot be thought of!

Again, plaster, especially plaster of Paris, or stucco, by its readiness to assume and to retain any shape into which it is moulded, and to take on any color that is applied to it, gives such opportunities for imitation of all kinds that it is practically impossible to neglect them. As a fact, for centuries this material has been freely used for ornamental purposes, such as mouldings, panels, foliage, and even figures in relief, which were originally wrought only in marble or stone. Nor has its use been confined to private dwellings. We meet it at every turn in palaces and public monu-

ments. If, therefore, anything originally attached to it of unworthiness or deceit, it has long since disappeared and, therefore, there is no reason why it should not be devoted to the same purposes in our churches.

We say to the same purposes, but not to every purpose to which it might lend itself. A cheap form of offering is always unworthy of God when one of the higher kind is within the reach of those who make it. But if it cannot be had, why may not an imitation be acceptable? If the mullions and tracery of a stained glass window, for example, cannot be put up in stone, why not in terra cotta? Why not even in wood? But when the available material has a beauty of its own, it is in better taste to preserve and, if possible, heighten that manner of beauty than to sacrifice it to false appearances. Transformations of the kind referred to are especially objectionable in churches, if the deceptive appearances are of a nature to wear off soon and reveal the original poverty of the material. The popular liking for what looks rich and costly may be indulged in temporary fittings and decorations; but in what is meant to last, severer canons of taste have to be followed. The whole question, in a word, is one of possibilities and of measure. It is also one of times and of places. There are certain practices originally objectionable which have become so common that nobody has now a right to find fault with them. Truth of material, as well as of construction and of purpose, is unquestionably a law of the beautiful in architecture, but not the only law, and consequently it may have to be modified in view of the requirements of the others. It is constantly made to yield, as we have seen, in classic and even in Gothic architecture, to the exigencies of the eye in regard to symmetry and to visible stability.

Such, then, are the essential elements or laws of architectural beauty: unity, variety, symmetry, proportion, stability, truth. Their presence may not always be noticed, but it is none the less a source of pleasure, and the absence of any one of them, if conspicuous, is painfully felt. This is why we call them essential. But there are others which bring with them a much stronger feeling of æsthetic enjoyment. We proceed to point them out briefly.

Size.—The first we may cite is greatness of dimensions. This is what imparts their grandeur to many monuments, ancient and modern. Why are the pyramids and the ruined temples of Egypt so impressive? Why do we contemplate with admiration the amphitheatres, the viaducts, and other monuments still standing, of the old Romans? Chiefly because of their colossal size. Why is it that we cannot approach the obelisk raised to the memory of Washington in the Capital City and try to take in its massive proportions and measure its prodigious height without experiencing a sense of sublimity like that awakened by the great spectacles of nature? Simply because of its gigantic size. Right through the Middle Ages this impressive feature was constantly aimed at when possible. One of the most striking aspects of the celebrated cathedrals and abbey churches of the period was their prodigious dimensions, dwarfing into insignificance all around them, like the saints to whose honor they were raised, or the Divinity itself of which they were the earthly dwelling place. The builders of the time, guided by their artistic instincts, succeeded in creating an impression even greater than the reality. Instead of enlarging the elements (columns, arches, niches, decorations, etc.) in proportion with the size of the edifice, they multiplied their number and thereby produced an effect of vastness, external and internal, far surpassing that of any other style of architecture. By following the opposite course, that is, by enlarging the elements, by covering greater spaces in the span of the arches, etc., modern architects have often diminished the apparent size of their work. The most colossal church ever built, St. Peter's, is positively disappointing when first seen, just because every element and detail is in proportion with the general dimensions.

Materials.—There has to be a certain correspondence between the edifice and the materials. If the latter are coarse or weak, they unavoidably suggest either poverty or parsimony, and detract from the effect of the building. If beautiful, they naturally add to it. Their beauty may consist in their extraordinary size, which always excites admiration. In most cases it is due to the superior quality of the material. Just as a marble statue is finer, nobler and more striking than a plaster cast of equally beautiful form, so, other qualities being equal, a church in stone is more dignified and

pleasing than if built in brick. In stone the strength of resistance, the fineness of grain, the richness of color, all add to the charm of the building. Marble stands highest of all and may atone for most defects. The admiration awakened by the cathedrals of Milan and New York is due in no small degree to the fact that they are both built in marble.

Lines and Outline.—What is most characteristic in an object is not so much its matter as its form. Form is the source of that individuality which causes things to differ from one another and makes them what they are. It is chiefly by their peculiarities of form that we recognize and discern them. This is true of monuments, as of most other things. It is their form we see first, and it is generally what strikes us most. Form is in a monument what attitude and bearing is in a man, a spontaneous revelation of character. The general form of a building is expressed by its outlines, that is by the line that marks it off from the background of its immediate surroundings or of the sky above it. Naturally this outline varies with the standpoint of the spectator, so that the same structure may present a great variety of outlines, some evidently superior to others. But in a well-conceived structure scarce any of them is entirely devoid of beauty. In the glare of midday sunshine reflected on all around, the outline of a monument is blurred and its charm in a great measure spoiled. But shortly after the sun has gone down and the shadow of approaching night has shut off the details of the structure, then its contour stands out in bold relief; the skyline in particular assumes a distinctness unknown at any other hour, and a halo of poetry and beauty surrounds even what had hitherto seemed commonplace and uninteresting. Gothic architecture, with its gables and towers and spires, lends itself in an especial manner to such effects.

But besides the contour lines which determine the shape of a building, all the others, if at all salient and repeated, contribute to its power of expression. For, owing to their numberless associations and analogies, even mere lines representing nothing definite are by their direction and shape full of suggestion. Straight lines and angular forms prevail in inorganic nature; they disappear in the organic world. Every living thing, plant or animal, from the primary cell to its complete development, presents only forms

more or less rounded. As a consequence, straight lines represent the rigidity of inanimate nature; curved, waving lines, the movement and suppleness of life. The nearer the latter come to the former the more suggestive are they of power. The branches of the oak tree standing out horizontally from the trunk convey the expression of strength; the drooping boughs of the willow, the bent stem of the lily, convey the sense of weakness, but of weakness redeemed by grace and elegance.

Now something of the same expression follows these lines when introduced into architecture. It may not be distinctly felt; but it is none the less real and abiding. The same holds good of the general direction of the lines of an edifice. Just as in a man the horizontal position suggests security, peace, repose, while the vertical or upright attitude means a sense of power, readiness for action, and, by uplifted hands and eyes, becomes the symbol of aspiration to what is higher, so the extension and repetition of horizontal lines in architecture convey an impression of serenity, of peace undisturbed, whereas strong sustained vertical lines are suggestive of activity, boldness, aspiration, or daring. Here lies chiefly the secret of the difference of expression between Greek and Gothic architecture. In the former the main lines are horizontal; in the latter the horizontal lines are broken up or vanish; the vertical lines abound; in every buttress and pier and column and shaft they start from the ground, and, instead of being cut off by the entablature, as in the Greek style, they continue their upward course until they lose themselves at last in the tracery of the vault, or in the highest point of spire and pinnacle.

Such are the leading elements of architectural beauty in a church. They are all desirable, most of them essential in some degree. When they are carried considerably beyond the necessary measure, they become a cause of special delight. But that measure is necessarily variable, and even when all is had in due proportion, an endless source of æsthetic enjoyment still remains to be utilized by the architect—*ornament* in its countless varieties and forms. To this new and most inviting subject we hope to return on a future occasion.

J. HOGAN.

Brighton, Mass.

A SEQUENCE FOR CANDLEMAS.

[The following beautiful Sequence of Adam of St. Victor is variously ascribed to the Feast of the Purification and to that of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin. Adam was such a player with words, used them with such subtilty of allusion, that one hesitates to decide whether the multiplication of the word *Lux*, with its counterpart in *luminosis*, implies merely its common meaning of "Day," or the liturgical symbolism of Candlemas—that *Lumen ad revelationem gentium* of Simeon's Canticle.]

LUX advenit veneranda,
Lux in choris jubilanda
Luminosis cordibus:
Huius laeta lux diei
Festum refert Matris Dei,
Dedicandum laudibus.

LIGHT hath come to every nation!
Sing it in your jubilation,
Hearts illumined by its rays!
Breaks the day in lucent glory
That repeats the olden story
Of the Virgin-Mother's praise.

Vox exultet modulata;
Mens resultet medullata;
Ne sit laus inutilis;
Sic laus Deo decantetur,
Ut in eo collaudetur
Mater eius nobilis.

Sing your song in holy measure:
Let the soul resound its pleasure—
O not useless is the song!
For unto the God of Heaven
Is the tribute truly given
When Her praises ye prolong.

Gloriosa dignitate,
Viscerosa pietate;
Compunctiva nomine:
Cum honore matronali,
Cum pudore virginali,
Nitet coeli cardine.

Dowered with a lofty splendor,
Graced with virtue deep and tender,
Crowned with a compelling Name—
With Thy matron-glory laden,
Thou remainest still a Maiden,
Moonlike set in Heaven's frame!

Rubus quondam exardebat,
Et hunc ardor non urebat,
Nec virorem nocuit:
Sic ardore spiritali,
Non a tactu coniugali,
Virgo Deum genuit.

As of old the Fire illuming
Moses' Bush, yet not consuming,
Blackened not its native bloom:
So the Holy Spirit's power
Flaming round that spotless Flower,
Fruitful left a Virgin's womb!

Haec sit ille fons signatus;
Hortus clausus, foecundatus,
Virtutum seminibus:

Fountain of prophetic sealing:
Walled Garden, yet revealing
Seeds of virtues in its sod:

Haec est illa porta clausa,
Quam latente Deus causa
Clauserat hominibus.

Thou, Ezechiel's wondrous Portal
Closèd unto every mortal
By the hidden Will of God!

Haec est vellus trahens rorem;
Plenum ager dans odorem
Cunctis terrae finibus:
Haec est virga ferens florem,
Terra suum salvatorem
Germinans fidelibus.

Thou the Fleece, with dew-pearls glowing,
Thou the Field, with fragrance flowing
Unto all the ends of earth:
Thou the Rod that bor'st the Flower,
Thou the Soil whose germ should dower
Men with a Redeemer's birth!

Haec est dicta per exemplum,
Mons, castellum, aula, templum,
Thalamus et civitas:
Sic eidem aliorum
Assignetur electorum
Nominis sublimitas.

Oft foretold in ancient story—
Tower, Mountain, Temple-glory,
Bridal Chamber of the King:
Thus the mystic thoughts reposing
In the other types, disclosing
But thy Name, their tributes bring!

Cuius preces, vitia,
Cuius nomen, tristia,
Cuius odor, lilia,
Cuius vincunt labia
Favum in dulcedine:
Super vinum sapida,
Super nivem candida,
Super rosam roscida,
Super lunam lucida
Veri solis lumine.

Thou whose prayer doth vice destroy,
Thou whose Name brings only joy,
Thou whose perfume shames the rose,
Thou whose lip with nectar flows
Sweeter than the honeycomb:
Ruddier than the rose art Thou,
Whiter than the driven snow,
Dewier than the rose pearl-strewn,
Brighter than the splendorous moon,
Shinest Thou in Heaven's dome!

Imperatrix supernorum,
Superatrix infernorum,
Eligenda via coeli,
Retinenda spe fideli,
Separatos a te longe,
Revocatos a te iunge.

Empress of the host supernal,
Victress over foes infernal,
Pathway leading unto Heaven
To be followed as 'twas given:
Call them back who far have wandered,
And, recalled, what they have squandered—
Show them how it may be won!

Mater bona quam rogamus,
Nobis dona quod optamus,
Nec sic spernas peccatores
Ut non cernas precatores:
Reos sibi diffidentes,
Tuos tibi confidentes,
Tuo siste Filio.

To Thy clients Thee addressing
Grant in fulness every blessing:
Nor the lowly sinner spurning,
But his prayerful heart discerning:
And thus all who feel their weakness,
And beseech Thy loving meekness,
Place beside Thy Saving Son!

H. T. HENRY.

Overbrook, Pa.

JOHN AUBREY AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES.

THE name of John Aubrey is perhaps not as familiar to the ears of the average reader as the names of Scott and Dickens. The writer of these lines confesses that until lately he knew of him only as a collector of odd superstitions about omens, oracles, voices, apparitions, impulses, knockings, and such other media of contact with the vast other-world. In the useful handbook called Chambers' Cyclopedia of English Literature only a few lines are vouchsafed to him, though he has now a more dignified niche in that enormous and brand-new Temple of Fame that is known as the Dictionary of (English) National Biography.

John Aubrey was born in 1626. His father was an English country gentleman, and seems to have bestowed some care on the boy's education. He had the same preceptor as the philosopher Hobbes, and was eventually sent to Oxford, of which "ingenouse place" he was always very fond. No doubt it was there that he acquired the taste for the local antiquities of Britain to which he owes his fame. The great libraries of the university, itself a museum of English history and architecture, the memories of Leland and Camden, the multitudinous remnants of a thousand years of vigorous creative Catholic faith, that epoch when

> "Centuries came and ran their course,
> And unspent all that time;
> Still, still went forth that Child's dear force,
> And still was at its prime,"

developed in his impressionable heart a great fondness for the

past of England, especially its monumental remains. Until his death in 1697 he was chiefly occupied with antiquarian research, and several of his unprinted works are still preserved in the Bodleian and Ashmolean libraries of Oxford, and in the British Museum.

That quaint genius, Anthony á Wood, the author of *Athenae Oxonienses* is indebted to Aubrey for many traits of his lives of Bacon, Milton, Raleigh, and Hobbes. It is true that when the historian of Oxford got into trouble through some communications from Aubrey, he decried as "folliries and misinformations" the correspondence of several years, and dubbed our author a "shiftless person." As a matter of fact, the reproach was deserved. With his father's large estates, Aubrey inherited many lawsuits, while his heart created other troubles for him, until about 1670 he found himself a poor man, dependent on friends and relations, notably on "Mr. Edmond Wyld, with whom I commonly take my diet and sweet otiums," he quaintly tells us.

Already in 1666, we learn, from a very curious little autobiographical record, that all his affairs "ran kim-kam, nothing tooke effect, as if I had been under an ill tongue. Treacheries and enmities in abundance against me." He calls his poverty and dependency a "happy delitescency." It must have permitted him fresh extravagances, for in 1677 he fell into the scholar's last ditch—he was compelled to part with his books. Though bred in the Middle Temple, he had never been called to the law—his fondness for antiquities being so great that he spent most of his time in their research. Thus he unearthed, in 1649, at the age of twenty-three, the great megalithic remains at Avebury and was long considered a superior authority on these ruins and on the huge monuments of Stonehenge. The great antiquarians, Leland and Camden and Dugdale, had incited many to a more detailed study of the relics of mediæval England,—Aubrey gave himself to the illustration of the antiquities of Surrey and Wiltshire, notably the latter.

In a little book published in 1714, entitled *Miscellanies on Several Curious Subjects*, we find an "Introduction to the Survey and Natural History of the North Division of the County of Wiltshire, by J. Aubrey, Esq." It is in this posthumous fragment

that he deals with the pre-Reformation life of England, enough at least to express his own views of the utility of the monasteries and the evils that their abolition had entailed on England.

"It is a sarcasm more malicious than true," he says, "commonly thrown at the Churchmen, that they had too much land; for their constitutions being in truth considered, they were rather administrators of those great revenues to pious and publick uses, than usufructuaries. As for themselves, they had only their habit and competent diet, every order according to their prescribed rule, from which they were not to vary. Then for their tenants, their leases were almost as good as fee simple, and perchance might longer last in their families. Sir William Button (the father) hath often told me that Alton farm had been held by their ancestors from the Abbey of Winchester about four hundred years. The Powers of Stanton Quintin held that farm of the Abbey of Cirencester in lease 300 years; and my ancestors, the Danvers, held West Tokenham for many generations of the Abbey of Broadstock, where one of them was a prior." . . . .

Did the new possessors of these ancient estates use them for the common good as did the Benedictines and many other religious families? The answer is writ large in the economical history of England for the next two centuries. Aubrey sounds the keynote when he says of his own shire:

"Since the Reformation and inclosures aforesaid these parts have swarmed with poor people. The parish of Caln pays for the poor (1663) £500 per annum; and the parish of Chippenham little less, as appears by the poors' books there. Inclosures are for the private, not for the public good. For a shepherd and his dogs or a milk maid can manage meadow land, that upon arable employed the hands of several scores of laborers." . . .

The violent and unjust confiscation of the Church lands by Henry VIII only transferred the ownership into the hands of his hungry courtiers. Here, as in most other cases, the Reformation found its guarantee of permanency in the immensity of the social wrong it accomplished. The new possessors had perforce disbursed great sums of money to the King,—in order to regain their own they raised the ancient rents. In the past immemorial

custom had kept the rents low and bearable—that custom which John Stuart Mill tells us is the most powerful protector of the weak against the strong, their sole protector where there are no laws or government adequate to the purpose.

In England this latter condition had been only too frequent in the century preceding the Reformation. Moreover, the new and illegitimate owners enclosed the immense commons which had hitherto been the free grazing-ground of the lowly farmer or villager. He was thereby suddenly subject to a double wrong, rack-renting and the loss of his free pasturage. On such noble foundations of sacrilege and injustice arise the prestige and power of more than a few of the proudest gentry of England. The tithes once due only to the Church, which paid them back to the Commonwealth abundantly in works of general benefit and utility were not lifted from the poor tenants, thus doubly oppressed by the lawyers of the Reformation. These tithes or Church-dues passed largely into the hands of laymen as charges on the lands. On the other hand, these same laymen repudiated all the ancient compensations by which the monastic bodies more than made up to the people what they exacted from their multitude of tenants and workingmen. Then again, as soon as the parochial clergy became a married body, the needs of their families depleted still more the former patrimony of the poor, who would never again call the King, as they did the first Henry, "the kinsman and advocate of the poor."

The English, while Catholic, had never forgotten the admirable instructions of Gregory the Great to St. Augustine, among which was one that bade him remember how the duty of a bishop was to set aside for the poor a fourth part of the income of his church. This was indeed a fundamental principle of Catholicism, the diaconal service, one of the oldest elements of the canon law that is illustrated (long before Gregory) by a multitude of noble documents and monuments that it would be wearisome to enumerate. The guilds and pious confraternities suppressed by the lawyers of the Reformation were another cause of the cancerous pauperism that began, then for the first time, to flourish in England. Its history has been so drastically told in Cobbett's immortal little book on the Reformation that I do not need to more than mention it.

"Every guild," says Bishop Stubbs, "was organized, among other ends, for the relief of distress as well as for conjoint and mutual prayer. It was with this idea that men gave large estates in land to the guilds that, down to the Reformation, formed an organized administration of relief." "The confiscation of their property," he says, in his *Constitutional History of England* (III, 648), "was one of the great wrongs perpetrated under Edward VI, one unquestionable cause of the growth of town pauperisms."

These truths are no longer denied. After Cobbett, the works of a whole school of historians of economics and commerce, like Professor Ashley, the publications of the Surtees Society, notably the Halmote Rolls, the old Churchwardens' Accounts edited by various individuals and societies, the works of the Camden Society the pages of the archæological press of England, the writings of Dom Gasquet, the revelations of many minor contemporary sources, have revealed to us the extent and intensity of the social and economic wrong worked upon the once comfortable poor of England by Thomas Cromwell and the legal harpies who carried into execution the dire principles of that unprincipled man.

It is instructive, however, to come across the substance of all this "new learning" in our old antiquary of Wiltshire.

"Destroying of manors began *temp.* Henry VIII," he says, in his short, jotty way. "By this method and by the selling of Church lands is the ballance of the Government quite altered and put into the hands of the common people. No ale-houses nor yet inns were there then unless upon great roads: when they had a mind to drink, they went to the fryaries, and when they traveled they had entertainment at the religious houses for three days, if occasion so long required. The meeting of the gentry was not then at tipling-houses, but in the fields and forests, with their bugle-horns in silken bordries. . . . This part was then a lovely champain, as that about Sherston and Cots-wold, very few enclosures except near houses, my grandfather Lyte did remember when all between Cromhall (at Easton) and Castle-Comb was so, when Easton, Yatton, and Comb did intercommon together. In my remembrance much hath been enclosed and every year more and more is taken in. Anciently the Leghs (now commonly called Slaights, *i. e.*, pastures) were noble large grounds, as yet the demesne lands at Castle-Comb. . . . Then were

a world of labouring people maintained by the plough, as yet in Northamptonshire. There were no rates for the poor in my grandfather's days: but for Kington St. Michael (no small parish) the Church-ale at Whitsuntide did the business. In every parish is (or was) a Church-house, to which belonged spits, crocks, etc., utensils for dressing provisions.[1] Here the house keepers met and were merry and gave their charity. The young people were there too and had dancing, bowling, shooting at butts, etc., the ancients sitting gravely by and looking on. All things were civil and without scandal."

After more than two centuries of expansion and glory, the poet Crabbe could pen in "The Village" (1783) the following classical lines as the absolute counterpart of what our genial old hunter of urns and brasses and black-letter so fondly remembered and so poetically described. What a far and weary cry from the mediæval "Church-house" to the modern "poor-house!"

> "Theirs is yon house that holds the parish poor,
> Whose walls of mud scarce bear the broken door;
> There where the putrid vapors flagging, play,
> And the dull wheel hums doleful through the day;
> There children dwell who know no parent's care,
> Parents, who know no children's love, dwell there;
> Heart-broken matrons on their joyless bed,
> Forsaken wives and mothers never wed,
> Dejected widows with unheeded tears,
> And crippled age with more than childhood-fears;
> The lame, the blind, and far the happiest they:
> The moping idiot and the madman gay."

In these pages Aubrey recalls the charitable collections made for the poor on the vigils of feasts and dedications of churches.

"Old John Wastfield of Langley was Peter-man at St. Peter's Chapel there; at which time is one of the greatest revels in these parts, but the Chapel is converted into a dwelling house. . . . Such joy and merriment was every holiday, which days were kept with great solemnity and reverence."

[1] Aubrey refers here to the mediæval parish club-house, the focus of all social life of the parish. "Beginning as a place for making the altar-bread, it developed into a bakery for the supply of the community. It then took up the brewing of beer to supply the people and the Church ales and similar festivals. This soon grew into the brewing of beer to supply those who required a supply. . . . The 'ale' was the ordinary way of raising money to meet extraordinary expenses."—Dom Gasquet, *Eve of the Reformation*, p. 341.

The large, free life of the old lords of the manors was very dear to Aubrey, himself a gentleman, loving to recall from Chaucer his strange knight's

> "high Reverence and Obeisaunce
> As well in Speech as in Countenaunce,
> That Gawain with his old Courtesie,
> Though he came again out of Fairie,
> He could him not amend of no word."

Their joustings and tourneys, their feudal courts, their escorts "in blue coats with badges," their state as of petty kings; their "rights" of upper and lower justice—mill, ford, tower; coinage, tribunal, gallows; their high blood begot of good living and their fierce feuds; their "great Gothick halls," with the hearth in the middle, and the retainers and servants who ate at the same table, below the salt; their halls of justice which were veritable armories, and their "mummings, cob-loaf-stealing, and great number of old Christmas plays,"—all these were delightful souvenirs to Aubrey, who was no democrat, and believed that entails should ever be in fashion as a good prop for monarchy. Yet throughout this brief introduction to the antiquities of one little corner of England there breathes a longing for the old organic unity of social life that was the chief characteristic of the Middle Ages; for that unbroken interchange of service, solace, example, and sacrifice that flowed from no mathematical formulæ of government, no scribe-drawn constitution daily wrenched and violated and circumvented by custom, or passion, or interest, or apathy. This intercommunion of hearts was the sacramental work of religion. The Middle Ages loved to typify her in the solemn symbolism of a crowned queen erect at the portal of the Cathedral, in flowing drapery, with the Cross in one hand and the "Cup of Salvation" in the other. The work of mediæval Catholicism was indeed a maternal work of infinite patience in training and formation, of educational effort in every direction, of authority ceaselessly working through voice and eye and example, of sacrifice of self so public, constant, and astounding that no one could gainsay it. The pledge and sanction, the proof and consummation, the vital energy of this manifold influence was in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar, out of and about which grew all the mediæval art and

architecture as the leaves and grapes grow naturally from the stem, its fruitage and its crown.

"Those who will read below the surface," says Dom Gasquet, "and will examine for themselves into the social life of the time, must admit, however much they feel bound to condemn the existing religious system, that it certainly maintained, up to the very time of its overthrow, a hold over the minds and hearts of the people at large, which nothing since has gained. Religion overflowed, as it were, into popular life, and helped to sanctify human interest, whilst the affection of the people was manifested in a thousand ways in regard to what we might now be inclined to consider the ecclesiastical domain. Whether for good or evil, religion in its highest and truest sense, at least as it was then understood, was to the English people as the bloom upon the choicest fruit. Whatever view may be taken as to advantage or disadvantage which came to the body politic or to individuals by the Reformation, it must be admitted that at least part of the price paid for the change was *the destruction of the sense of corporate unity and common brotherhood*, which was fostered by the religious unanimity of belief in the country, and which, as the main-spring of its life, and the very central point of its being, centered in the Church, with its rites and ceremonies."[2]

Certainly Aubrey was no Romanizer in his time. Among his notes on "Day-Fatality," is one concerning the twenty-sixth parliament of Henry VIII, "so fatal to Rome's concerns here, in which the Pope, with all his authority, was clean banished the realm, he no more to be called than the Bishop of Rome." After stating the king's headship of the Church, he adds, I think with a sly malice, "also the first fruits and tenths of all spiritual promotions and dignities were granted to the king," and subjoins, "not long after which followed the visitation of abbies, priories, and nunneries, and after that their final suppression; this Parliament being the door or entrance thereto." In the light of the preceding extracts he clearly condemns the time-serving men who then enslaved the English Church to her unworthy laymen with chains no longer to be riven by merely human hands.

[2] "Parish Life in Catholic England," in his *Eve of the Reformation*, p. 324.

We shall scarcely err if we rank our antiquarian among those men of England whom Dom Gasquet describes in his essay on "England and the Pope," to whom the communion with Rome was visible through a blurred and distorted medium of the last two or three centuries of the English Middle Ages, when the history of mixed jurisdiction was still fresh, and a factor, so that "the real issue of the spiritual headship was obscured by the plea of national sentiment and safeguards." As we shall see, Aubrey has frequently a Catholic mind. His antiquarian studies, in which he was "no slender master," led him to the venerable close of the ancient Church, if not to her altars, as it happily did another fond student of ecclesiastical antiquities, Augustus Welby Pugin.

II.

It is notorious that the numerous Grammar Schools of Catholic England before the Reformation were founded as pious works by clergy and laity, and carried on chiefly by the clergy out of devotion to learning.[3] The numerous poor students at Oxford and Cambridge were supported, directly or indirectly, by the revenues of churchmen. Schools like Eton and Harrow were founded originally for the children of the poor. To-day neither at Eton nor Harrow, neither at Oxford nor at Cambridge, does a shred remain of the old Catholic good-will towards the poor scholar. Like the tithes and the lands, the patrimony of needy learning has long been made over to the rich and the well-born. While the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge entered upon a time of decay immediately after the Reformation, the number of English students at the continental universities greatly diminished, owing, no doubt, in part to the venomous and narrow spirit of men like Roger Ascham. Sir Thomas More was of opinion that the Reformation was to blame for stifling the already reviving interest in Biblical and Patristic studies among churchmen. A Venetian traveller in 1500 noted that in England "few excepting the clergy are addicted to the study of letters, . . . and yet

[3] The reader will consult with profit Mr. Arthur Leach's studies collected in his late work on the *Secondary Education in England before the Reformation*. *Cf.* also Grant's *Burgh Schools of Scotland*.

they have great advantages for study, there being two general universities in the kingdom, Oxford and Cambridge, in which there are many colleges founded for the maintenance of poor scholars." In 1498, Erasmus could write to Colet, that England abounded in men of letters, and in 1517 he wrote to Richard Pace as follows: "Oh, how truly happy is your land of England, the seat and stronghold of the best studies and the highest virtue! I congratulate you, my friend, Pace, on having such a king, and I congratulate the king whose country is rendered illustrious by so many brilliant men of ability."

Even worldly ecclesiastics, like Cardinal Wolsey, loved to rear splendid buildings for the education of the poor, and to turn over to the cause of education the accumulated revenues of which they knew in conscience that Holy Church only made them administrators. Prior Charnock at Oxford, and Abbot Bere at Glastonbury, were no rare exceptions for elegant learning. Prior Selling of Canterbury, and Bishop Langton of Winchester, were devoted to the education of youth. The latter kept school in his own house—one of his scholars I have already mentioned—the famous humanist and diplomatist, Doctor Richard Pace. Aubrey loves to dwell on this period. After quoting from Plato that the foundation of government is the education of youth, he adds:

"By this means it is most probable that *that was a golden age*. I have heard Judge Jenkins, Mr. John Latch, and other lawyers say that before the Reformation one shall hardly in a year find an action on the case, as for slander, etc., which was the result of good government."

Our antiquarian had an eye for the picturesque: had he undertaken in his day the production of a book like Fosbrooke's *British Monachism*, how much more grave and truthful a portrait he would have drawn than is offered in that splenetic and one-sided work of miscellaneous erudition!

"The country was very full of religious houses; a man could not have travelled but he must have met monks, friars, *bonnehommes*, etc., in their several habits,—black, white, grey, etc. And the tingle-tangle of their convent bells, I fancy, made very pretty musick like the colleges at Oxford. Then were there no free-schools; the boys

were educated at the monasteries; the young maids not at Hackney schools, etc., to learn pride and wantonness; but at the nunneries, where they had examples of piety, humility, modesty, obedience, etc., to imitate and practise. Here they learned needle-work, and the art of confectionery, surgery, physick, writing, drawing, etc."

What a pretty picture does he outline of the teaching customs of the pious gentle-women of pre-Reformation England! Aubrey had been in his youth a collaborator at Dugdale's *Monasticon*, and had caught the spirit of that noble work.

"Old Jaques (who lived where Charles Hadnam did) could see from his house the nuns of the priory of St. Mary's (juxta Kington) come forth into the nymph-hay with their rocks and wheels to spin, and with their sewing-work. He would say that he hath told three-score and ten, though of nuns there were not so many, but in all, with lay-sisters, as widows, old maids, and young girls, there might be such a number. This was a fine way of breeding up young women, who are led more by example than by precept, and a good retirement for widows and grave single women to a civil, virtuous, and holy life."

Can we not imagine all England covered with many a house like St. Mary's at Kington? They were the workshops or *ateliers* in which the more delicate of the fine arts found shelter,—tapestry, embroidery, the making of vestments, the adornment of processions and festal days. A "Field of the Cloth of Gold" was possible only by reason of the century-long labors and acquired skill of thousands of religious women, whose devotion to the Blessed Sacrament was the starting-point of endless artistic labors in a later age. A history of lace-making—what the Middle Ages called "English work," and of the fine branches of illumination is a history of female religious for a thousand years. Between the chapters of Montalembert on the Anglo-Saxon nuns and those of Dom Gasquet on the dissolution of their venerable and beneficent communities lies a whole world of endeavor and act,—a "making" of England in a moral and spiritual sense, so effective and permanent that Shakspere, as in *Measure for Measure*, seldom speaks of a nun but as "a thing ensky'd and sainted," "an immortal spirit,"

"And to be talked with in sincerity
As with a saint."

I cannot resist the temptation to cull also the following paragraph from an author who was certainly close kin to much that is Catholic. For its love of the Fathers and of mediæval Christian art Oxford has always been privileged to preserve a certain crypto-Catholicism that one day flowered in John Henry Newman.

"The Crusado's to the Holy Ware were most magnificent and glorious, and the rise, I believe, of Knights-Errant and romances. The solemnities of processions in and about the churches, and the perambulations in the fields, besides their convenience, were fine, pleasing diversions, the priests went before in their formalities, singing the Latin service, and the people came after, making good-meaning responses. The reverence given to holy men was very great. Then were the churches open all day long, men and women going daily in and out hourly to and from their devotions. Then were the consciences of the people kept in so great awe by confession, that just dealing and virtue were habitual. Sir Edwin Sandys observed, in his travels in the Catholic countries, so great use of confession as aforesaid, that, though a severe enemy to the Church of Rome, he doth heartily wish it had never been left out by the Church of England, perceiving the great good it does beyond sea. Lent was a dismal time, strictly observed by fasting, prayer, and confessing against Easter. During the forty days the Fryars preached every day."

If Aubrey lived in our day he would be an invaluable member of the Society for Psychical Research. The only printed work of his is entitled, *Miscellanies upon Various Subjects*, and appeared as late as 1696, the year before his death.[4] In it he gathers a curious series of facts, ancient and modern, that bear on the phenomena of the spirit, or other-world life,—portents, omens, dreams, voices, apparitions, invisible blows, prophecies, magic, visions, in beryls or crystals, and without them, converse with angels and spirits, days lucky and unlucky, oracles, ecstasies, etc. He is a firm believer in their existence and their influence upon the world of man and nature.[5] Toland calls him superstitious,

[4] *Miscellanies upon Various Subjects*, by John Aubrey, F.R.S. (Library of Old Authors), London, 1890.

[5] "The matter of this collection is beyond human reach: we being miserably in the dark as to the economy of the invisible world, which knows what we do or incline to, and works upon our passions, and sometimes is so kind as to offer us a glimpse of its prescience."—*Ibid.*, p. 15.

but admits that he "was a very honest man and most accurate in his account of matter and fact." He seldom expatiates, merely chronicles the events or facts that strike him under each rubric. He is very catholic in his authorities, citing at one moment Cicero on Divination, and Cardanus on Dreams, and the next giving two letters from Scotland on the Second Sight. They are extremely curious, these asseverations about the humble "Lochiels" of Ross and Inverness, the Macleans, Macdonalds, Macphersons, and Mackenzies, who are gifted or afflicted with a wider and earlier vision than their neighbors, "some say by compact with the devil, some say by converse with those daemons we call fairies." This "Accurate Account of Second-Sighted Men" might well go as a counterpart to Kirke's very entertaining "Secret Commonwealth of the Fairies," written about the same time, and edited by Andrew Lang in the *Bibliothèque Carabas*. We are a little shaken by the admission that this great gift could be gotten "for a pound or two of tobacco," and by the insinuation that John du beg Mac Gregor exercised it "after having gotten a little more than ordinary of that strong liquor they were drinking." Mr. Lang would surely appreciate the scientific remark of Aubrey, when speaking of a London catalogue of some "periodical small-poxes." "It were to be wished that more such observations were made in other great towns." And Stevenson would have made a chapter of genius out of the remarks on "Visions in a Beryl or Crystal." Perhaps the worlds of sense and ultra-sense dovetail strangely into one another, and the poet is a stern realist when he holds that

> "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
> Than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

There will always be a surplus of people who will prefer to believe it a very suitable thing that

> "A little ere the mightiest Julius fell,
> The graves stood tenantless, and the sheeted dead
> Did squeak and gibber in the streets of Rome."

For them Aubrey is a genuine treasure, a man of faith and sense and shrewdness all made up. He has the story of "the White Lady of Berlin, who always appears when one dies out of the Electoral House of Brandenburgh." The prophecies of St.

Malachy, he says, "are exceeding strange." *He* believes that "the chymist can draw subtile spirits that will work upon one another at some distance." There are "spirits celestial, more subtile than any alkalies and acids." How strange that Aubrey should find an echo in so eminent a modern chemist as William Crookes!

Apropos of this book, Aubrey makes in it some curious observations about Catholics. Speaking about "invisible blows," he says that "the Papists are full of these observations;" and of the ecstasy of a poor widow's daughter in Hertfordshire, that "had this been in some Catholick country it would have made a great noise." These remarks are not made unsympathetically by a man whom William Yeats, that philosopher of a delicate occultism, might have made use of. Elsewhere, speaking of impulses, he repeats the well-known story of St. Pius V and the battle of Lepanto (1571). "The Pope," he says, "by the like instinct being at Rome in the consistory, did speak of the engagement in the famous battle of Lepanto, and that the Christians were the victors, the fight at sea being two hundred miles or more distant from them."

Of course in his chapter on "Day-Fatality," he could not avoid remembering, anent the twenty-third day of November, that "Sir Kenelm Digby, that renowned knight, great linguist and magazine of arts," was born and died on that day, also that he fought fortunately at Scanderoun on the same day.

> "'Tis rare that one and self-same day should be
> The day of birth, of death, of victory."

On the third of November he commemorates Cardinal Borromeo, "famous for his sanctity of life, and therefore canonized." With a typical antiquarian sympathy he remembers that this same day, his birthday, was as fatal to himself as it was to Earl Godwin 580 years before, whose lands in Kent were overflowed on that day and are henceforth known as Godwin's Sands." Just such an accident happened to Kentish lands of his own, that once brought four nobles an acre, but thereafter "were never worth one farthing to me." Of Wednesday he records that "it is said to have been the fortunate day of Pope Sixtus Quintus, that Pope of

renowned merit that did so great and excellent things in the time of his government."

Among the many anecdotes related by Aubrey are several about King Charles the First. He quotes in Latin "an admirable chronogram upon King Charles the Martyr," and relates several lugubrious incidents that preceded his execution. It would seem that Aubrey might have been a non-juror in a later day,—he could not condone the death of the legitimate Stuart King. For Oliver Cromwell he had therefore a sound hate. Apropos of the third of September, a lucky day for the great Puritan, he calls him "the English Attila," quite an excess of feeling for our cautious and patient seventeenth-century Oldbuck. The Parliament of 1640, he says, was "dreadfully fatal to England in its peace, its wealth, its religion, its gentry, its nobility; nay, its King." He records the capture of a great whale at Greenwich, and adds that "'Tis said Oliver was troubled at it." Speaking of secret impulses, like that of St. Pius V, he contributes to the life of Cromwell the following curious anecdote:

"Oliver Cromwell had certainly this afflatus. One that I knew that was at the battle of Dunbar, told me that Oliver was carried as with a divine impulse, he did laugh so excessively as if he had been drunk, his eyes sparkled with spirits. He obtained a great victory, but the action was said to be contrary to human prudence. The same fit of laughter seized Oliver Cromwell just before the battle of Naseby, as a kinsman of mine, and a great favorite of his, Colonel J. P., then present, testified. Cardinal Mazarine said that he was a lucky fool."

Aubrey believed himself possessed with an irresistible impulse to his chosen task. "This searching after antiquities is a wearisome task," he wrote near the end of his life. "Yet I am carried about with a kind of *œstrum* (inspiration), . . . a kind of gratitude and good nature to revive the memories and memorials of the pious and charitable benefactors long since dead and gone." His "Minutes of Lives," that Anthony á Wood made such good use of, prove him to have been justly called "an immature Boswell."[6] The same gossipy strain is noticeable in his *Miscellanies*,

[6] They may be found in the work: *Letters Written to Eminent Persons in the XVII–XVIII Centuries*. London, 1813.

whose terse and firm yet "colored" style is by no means without charm, as the specimens herein quoted may show. His acquaintance was wide and distinguished. In the chapter on "Dreams," he tells of one that was related to him by "William Penn, proprietor of Pennsylvania." Apropos of the founder of Philadelphia, speaking of the ancient inhabitants of Britain, "almost as savage as the beasts whose skins were their only raiment," he remarks "they were only two or three degrees, I suppose, less savage than the Americans." His contemporary, Sir Thomas Browne, loved to speak of "that great antiquity, America," and was deeply interested in its future, of which he has left a curious prophecy. In Britton's life of our author is given the brief entry of his burial at Oxford, in the Church of St. Mary Magdalene:

§ 1697, John Aubrey, a stranger, was Buryed, Jun. 7th.

It is characteristic enough of his retired and uneventful life among the mounds of Avebury or Stonehenge, or in the recesses of old libraries and museums. He was one of those humble scholars whose inexhaustible patience and long-sustained labors raise the pedestals on which others shine. His faults redounded only to his own disadvantage; his virtues were exercised for the good of all the republic of learning. He was more Catholic than he himself, mayhap, suspected.

In an age that saw the English people welcome a Protestant German line rather than tolerate Catholicism, Aubrey could write in a feeling and Catholic way of Thomas à Becket as a saint and a martyr. His place is among the great antiquarians who illustrated in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the mediæval life of England, and labored, unconsciously enough, for the preservation of feelings of respect, admiration, and love for the ten thousand monuments of the Catholic piety, skill, and learning of their forebears. It could not but happen that one day men should ask, as they do now, if it were then so wise and happy a deed to overthrow a religion that had given such proofs of its adaptability to the character and genius of England. Were John Aubrey with us to-day, he would be the first to echo the profoundly true words of the late Dean Church, concerning the "men of religion" of mediæval England:

"It was in these men, and in the Christianity which they taught, and which inspired and governed them, that the fathers of our modern nations first saw exemplified the sense of human responsibility, first learned the nobleness of a ruled and disciplined life, first enlarged their thoughts of the uses of existence, first were taught the dignity and sacredness of honest toil. These great axioms of modern life passed silently from the special homes of religious employment to those of civil; from the cloisters and cells of men who, when they were not engaged in field-work or book-work, clearing the forest, extending cultivation, multiplying manuscripts, to the guild of the craftsman, the shop of the trader, the study of the scholar. Religion generated and fed these ideas of what was manly and worthy in man. Once started, they were reinforced from other sources; thought and experience enriched, corrected, and coördinated them. But it was the power and sanction of a religion and a creed which first broke men into their yoke that now seems so easy, gradually wrought their charm over human restlessness and indolence and pride, gradually reconciled mankind to the ideas, and the ideas to mankind, gradually impressed them as that vague but yet real thing which we call the general mind and thought of a nation."[7]

Perhaps we shall not frequently behold again upon the soil of England, the marvellous scene which Matthew Arnold, that most dissatisfied of modern poets, has carved for us in such sculpturesque and flawless verse:

> The silent courts, where night and day
> Into their stone-carved basins cold
> The sparkling icy fountains play—
> The humid corridors behold,
> Where, ghostlike in the deepening night,
> Cowl'd forms brush by in gleaming white!
>
> The chapel, where no organ's peal
> Invests the stern and naked prayer!—
> With penitential cries they kneel
> And wrestle; rising then, with bare
> And white uplifted faces stand,
> Passing the Host from hand to hand.

The life of Charterhouse and hermitage is foreign enough to the England of to-day, that seeks on many seas and in many lands

[7] *The Gifts of Civilization* (1892), p. 240.

the goods despised by the hearts out of which rose Ely and Durham and Peterborough. The rupees of Delhi, the silks and curios of the Summer Palace, the diamonds of Kimberley, the inexhaustible gold of the Rand,—these be her gods, that with Babylonic frenzy she exhibits in cosmopolitan pomp, intoxicating the nations with delight and envy. Is there any cure for the awful fever of her life except in a return to the Catholicism that once made her happy in piety and self-restraint?

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

THE PRIEST IN THE SICK-WARD.

The Last Rites.

> "Infirmatur quis in vobis? inducat presbyteros Ecclesiae et orent super eum unguentes cum oleo in nomine Domini."—Jacob 5 : 14.

IN a former article of the REVIEW,[1] I spoke of the signs which announce probable danger of death by sickness; and what was said there was intended to serve as a guide to the young levite when summoned to the sick-bed in the parish. The present paper supposes the signs of approaching death in evidence, and transfers the scene of priestly ministrations to the sick-ward, in the hospital, where disease is visible in its protean forms.

If, as Cardinal Gibbons says in his admirable work *The Ambassador of Christ*, "the true priest has the noblest mission on earth, not only because he offers up the Lamb of God on the altar, but also because he immolates himself on the altar of duty and charity," then, in a fuller sense, do these words apply to him who at the call of duty and charity "spends himself and is spent" for the spiritual welfare of suffering humanity in the hospital.

It may be said that between sick-calls in the district and those in the hospital there is a great difference. In the one case

[1] *Cf.* April, 1900, p. 388.

only ordinary diseases are met with; while in the other the minister of God finds himself in close and constant attendance on sufferers from extraordinary disease, not seldom of a most repulsive and unsightly character. Lupus, gangrene of the lungs, smallpox, erysipelas in its worst forms, cancers of various kinds, and virulent fevers are some of the many diseases with which he is brought into contact.

But apart from the specific character of the disease with which duty and charity must constantly bring him in touch, the neophyte will find himself confronted with a variety of difficulties not experienced outside an institution. Obviously there is not the same privacy in a public ward as in a parishioner's home—a matter that gives rise to some perplexity in the case of one coming fresh from the collegiate halls. True, he will find a trained nurse at hand, who will acquaint him with the condition of the patient; and this in a measure facilitates matters, though it does not compensate for additional difficulties. He must hear the patient's confession in a large ward where the beds are close together, and their occupants within ear-shot; he must guard against possible scandal; and anoint and communicate in circumstances requiring the exercise of great discretion.

To offer, then, some remarks of a nature helpful to the young priest in the administration of the last rites, under such existing circumstances, is the object of this article. I will embody my remarks under the following heads: (1) Hearing Confessions; (2) Extreme Unction; (3) Holy Viaticum; (4) The Last Blessing.

1. Hearing Confessions.—The first difficulty that presents itself under this head, I think, is the wearing of the stole. Often it cannot be worn, at least openly, without danger of attracting attention where prying eyes and prurient ears are many. Screens may often be had, though from personal experience I have found that in many instances they are more dangerous than serviceable, since nurses are constantly moving about the ward and may be close at hand, yet unobserved. But where screens are not available, and the stole if worn would be a serious danger, it may be said there is no obligation *sub gravi* to wear the stole beneath one's coat. This, when feasible, is the better thing to do, for the reason that the priest by doing so is following out the rubrics as

best he can, and is reminded of the fact that he is administering a Sacrament. It must be borne in mind that the stole is something more than a "signum jurisdictionis externum," as de Herdt, I n, B 7, points out: "Usus enim stolae non ita accipiendus est, ut sit signum jurisdictionis, sed ab actuali exercitio, quod juxta rubricas stolam requirit, ut vestis sacerdotalis, et quandoque tantum ut distinctivum officii, quod quis habet." And in connection with this matter I would refer the reader to the Constitution of Benedict XIV, *Inter Omnigenas*, February 2, 1744, in which the Pope approves of a local law prescribing the wearing of the stole under the garments when the priest carries the Blessed Sacrament to the sick in Albania.

I pass on now to the consideration of the material integrity of confession. The usual difficulties which affect this matter are to be found in cases of the deaf, or deaf and dumb, the very ignorant and simple, and where serious danger to health threatens the penitent or confessor if the confession be complete.

As regards those who are dumb or who cannot speak at the time from other causes, the confessor will best elicit answers from the penitent by getting him to respond with a pressure of the hand; but when the penitent is a female this should only be done in a public ward, when screens are used, and then not always.

With reference to deaf people, or deaf and dumb, I would point out the usefulness to a priest of knowing the deaf and dumb alphabet. Oftentimes the sick can be instructed and received into the Church by its means. Here I would add that apart from *grave incommodum* and *periculum manifestationis* a mute, according to the common opinion of theologians, is bound to commit his confession to writing if he can do so.[2]

Speaking of another class of penitents—the very ignorant and simple, let me refer to what St. Alphonsus says respecting them. He says such, apart from danger of death, *may* be absolved when they say they are sorry for their sins, although they confess no specific sin. From this, therefore, it is clear that when they are in danger of death they can and ought to be absolutely absolved.

[2] Vide Kenrick, *Tract. de Poenit.*, VIII, 61: "Muti—si scribere possint, absque manifestationis periculo, videntur teneri; qui enim nequit ore confiteri, debet, qua ratione valet, sua peccata revelare."

Frassinetti, in his work called *Priests' Manual*,[3] refers to another instance when the material integrity must suffer, viz., when questions cannot be put without injury or danger to the penitent's health. These are his words: "When the patient, according to his capacity, has done all within his power, the confessor is not bound to interrogate him further, even though he might foresee that the examination was of consequence."

Some of the cases which, I think, justify the sacrifice of the material integrity to a greater or lesser extent, by reason of danger to health or grave inconvenience, are—

(1) when a patient is afflicted with profuse hæmoptysis, and talking would expose him to a sudden relapse;

(2) when a patient is suffering from acute bronchitis and is cyanotic and breathing is extremely labored owing to the choked state of his lungs;

(3) in the later stages of phthisis, when laryngitis may render it almost impossible for the sick person to talk;

(4) in the case of pericarditis, when the membrane of the heart is greatly inflamed, causing great difficulty in speaking.

Among the diseases dangerous to the confessor may be enumerated typhus, scarlet fever, diphtheria, and smallpox.

And while treating of infectious diseases it may be well to remark that it is advisable for the confessor to keep his face averted as much as possible from the penitent; and I would here point out that when hearing the confessions of those suffering from cancer, he will do well to kneel so as to keep below the patient, as the offensive exhalations rise upwards.

To conclude: When patients are *in extremis* and death is instant the form of absolution used is:—"Ego te absolvo ab omnibus censuris et peccatis in nomine Patris, etc." Should they lose consciousness before the confession is completed they are, if contrite, absolutely absolved.

2. Holy Viaticum.—Coming to the question of Holy Viaticum I will begin by drawing attention to what Gury says on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, 322, Q. 7, about administering Holy Viaticum to deaf-mutes. "The Blessed Sacrament," he remarks, "may be administered to such persons if they give evi-

[3] Pp. 309–310.

dence of discretion and sufficient instruction." Scavini, again, says: "Si praeter instructionem in genere necessariam satis distinguant particulam consecratam a pane naturali, licet ipsorum idea tam clara non sit, quam parvolorum qui usu omnium sensuum gaudeant, talibus communio danda est si urget praeceptum." Hence it follows that if a clear and accurate knowledge of the Real Presence is not demanded when the Paschal precept is in force, *a fortiori* this is the case when a deaf-mute is in danger of death. But in hospitals, I think, it is dangerous *ratione irreverentiae* to administer Holy Viaticum to such a one unless the priest has a knowledge of his previous life. Patients of this class are apt to take the Blessed Sacrament out of their mouths or otherwise to expose it to irreverence. And the same applies equally to lunatics and imbeciles. On this point St. Thomas says Holy Viaticum should be given, "si prius quando erant compotes suae mentis apparuit in eis devotio hujus Sacramenti." Under this head must be classed, likewise, persons in delirium and epileptics whose minds have become greatly weakened by frequent fits.

When a patient is afflicted with vomiting and is conscious, one can best judge whether he is liable to a return by his own statement; but it is prudent to wait some considerable time before attempting to administer Holy Viaticum when the patient has been vomiting. Authors differ as to the length of time that should intervene in such a case. Some say six hours should elapse; others, considerably less. A priest, however, will act prudently if he waits for four hours before giving a patient Holy Viaticum. Dr. Capellmann, in his *Pastoral Medicine*, says: "In cholera, vomiting takes place very frequently; and an interval of two to four hours, but certainly of six, shows a change which gives hope for an intermission of vomiting. But in diseases and lesions of the brain, in diseases of the kidney, in inflammation of the bowels, vomiting ensues at shorter and more regular intervals. During those affections I should require a non-recurrence of vomiting for at least twelve hours before I would allow Communion to be given."

In cases where the patient after receiving Holy Communion, as sometimes happens, rejects It immediately, the sacred species should be taken away and kept until corrupted, and then deposited in the sacrarium, or failing that should be put in the fire.

Most difficulties in the question of administering Holy Viaticum arise either from a difficulty to the patient in swallowing or from obstinate vomiting. The first difficulty may arise—

(1) from the very parched condition of the patient's mouth, as in many fevers and pneumonia, in which case the priest should give the communicant a little water to drink beforehand or immediately after he had received Holy Viaticum;

(2) from tumors, abscesses, etc., pressing on the throat or gullet;

(3) from a narrowing of the gullet, generally due to scalds or poisoning by strong acids or, again, to cancerous growth;

(4) from diseases of the larynx, occurring, at times, in phthisis or cancerous disease and diphtheria;

(5) from after wounds, caused by accident or operation, on the neck;

(6) and may occur in various nervous cases, as St. Vitus' dance and hysteria;

(7) and in the case of maniacs where they refuse to take any food.

In all such cases the patient should first be tested with a little bread or an unconsecrated particle.

Obstinate vomiting occurs in—

(1) stomach disease (*a*) when there is inflammation, common in heavy drinkers; (*b*) when there are cancerous growths preventing the passage of food from the stomach on into the intestines;

(2) in late stages of Bright's disease;

(3) in some nervous states, as, for example, tumor of the brain;

(4) in intestinal obstruction and strangulated hernia (in such cases the vomit becomes "fæcal");

(5) in cases where paroxysms of coughing occur, as in whooping cough (common among children). And here I would point out that by giving food immediately after a paroxysm, vomiting may be sometimes avoided, as another fit of coughing may not happen for some time.

I will go on to consider next the question of giving Holy Viaticum to one not fasting. Where the disease is of a fatal

character and directly endangering life it is always lawful to administer It to a patient not fasting. The question of giving Holy Viaticum frequently during a lingering sickness is somewhat controverted. There are authors who assert It may be given often, not in the ordinary form while the danger is present, but *per modum viatici.*" While, again, others affirm that Communion should be administered *per modum viatici* only once *in eodem periculo mortis.* According to this latter opinion, therefore, once Holy Viaticum has been given, Communion, whether the patient be fasting or not, should be administered to him with the ordinary form, "Corpus Domini," etc. Needless to say, in cases of frequent administration a priest must use his own discretion. Father Lehmkuhl pertinently observes, II, n. 161: "Durante periculo toties quoties devotio et dispositio poenitentis hoc suadet, S. Communio eodem modo repeti potest, jejunio neglecto, neque quod aegrotus quum sanus erat S. Communionem non tam frequenter sumpsit, ratio est cur etiam nunc, modo satis dispositus sit, raro ad eam admittatur."

In concluding my remarks on this subject I may fitly allude to the decree of the S. Congregation of Indulgences, February 5, 1841, which lays down the necessity of the *Confiteor* being recited three times, *i. e.*, before Holy Viaticum, before Extreme Unction, and before the Last Blessing, even though they are all administered together.

3. Extreme Unction.—Although the direct object of the Sacrament is to fortify the dying in their last hour, yet indirectly it often, under God's providence, brings about the recovery of the bodily health. It is, therefore, unlawful to defer its administration until there is no possible hope of recovery. All that is required is that there is probable danger of death by *sickness.* The causes, then, justifying the administration of this Sacrament must be internal to the sick man and not external. Hence a priest cannot anoint *per se* a person about to undergo a surgical operation, any more than he can anoint a soldier going into battle, or a criminal about to be hanged on the gallows. But Extreme Unction is administered *per accidens* before a surgical operation, when the disease that renders an operation necessary is in itself proximately dangerous to life. We have an instance when the

priest would not anoint in a case where a patient is suffering from a malignant cancer, but from which no immediate danger of death is foreseen; and for the simple reason that the danger here arises not from the disease *per se*, but from the operation about to be performed.

Here I would suggest that when through an accident one organ of sense is absent, as in the case of the ear, or when again both senses cannot be anointed because bandaged (a common occurrence in a hospital), the anointing of one sense is certainly sufficient for the validity of the Sacrament; and when cases arise in which an organ of sense cannot be anointed, for instance, the nose, foot, etc., one anoints the nearest part.

In the case of imminent death a priest should give absolution and proceed straightway to the *Confiteor* and to the words, "in nomine Patris . . . extinguatur in te;" or should it be evident that delay is dangerous he should immediately begin the anointing with the form, "Per istam S. unctionem," etc. But where time will not admit even of this he should anoint the senses of the head, using one form for all the organs, *i. e.*, "Per istam S. unctionem . . . indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid deliquisti per sensus, visum, auditum, odoratum, gustum, et tactum." In a still more urgent case he should anoint the forehead only with the form, "Per istam S. unctionem . . . indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid deliquisti per sensus."

If the sick man be still living after having been anointed by the short form, the senses individually should be *anointed sub conditione;* and the *prayers omitted must be supplied in the order* in which they are *prescribed* in the Ritual.[4] Should the patient die during the process of anointing, the priest should immediately

[4] *Vide*, Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Mor.*, Vol. II, Pars II, lib. I, Tract. VI, n. 572: "Inclinandum tamen est, saltem si aegrotus alia sacramenta secure suscipere non potuit, in repetitionem conditionatam unctionum singularum sub suis formis particularibus. Nam licet internam rationem nullitatis sacramenti vix ullam videam, extrinsecus accita auctoritas aliquorum theologorum, qui de valore talis modi dubitanter loquuntur, ratio sufficiens est cur sacramentum quod adeo necessarium esse possit, conditionate repetatur." Cf. Kenrick, II, *Tract. de Ext. Unct.* ii, 11: "Quae praescribuntur sacerdoti recitandae orationes integre perficiendae sunt nisi immineat mors; quo casu licebit ungere statim periclitantem, et preces deinceps prout Rituale monet."

begin the *Commendatio animae.* In all cases of doubt as to whether a person be dead or not the conditional form is used, viz.: "Si vivas, per istam S. unctionem," etc. When several persons have to be anointed, as may happen in a hospital, the organs of each are anointed as usual, while the prayers and psalms are recited in the plural number for all.

In considering the question of contagious diseases I would remark that the five senses are anointed under the single form. And in cases of this kind the anointing may be done with a match or something of that kind. One guards against contagion if one uses a separate piece of wool soaked in the Holy Oil for the anointing of the different organs of sense.[6]

The ordinary precautions to be adopted in attending contagious cases such as smallpox, scarlet fever, etc., are—

(1) never to attend such cases, when it can be avoided, on an empty stomach;

(2) to wash the hands with carbolic soap immediately after attending a patient;

(3) when possible, to wear some kind of "overall" above one's clothing;

(4) never to insert the thumb after anointing any organ into the oilstock, but to use a separate piece of wool for the purpose.

Let me add here that syphilis is a contagious disease a priest should be on his guard against. It differs from the diseases above mentioned in that actual contact of the virus is essential to its transmission, *i. e.*, either the discharge from the sore itself, or some of the secretions, as saliva, of the patient must come in contact with another person before the disease is transmitted. In other words, it is not air-borne. Should a priest, therefore, come into contact with the saliva of the patient or the discharge from a sore he should always take the precaution of washing his hands with carbolic soap, or the like.

[5] Dr. Capellmann on this matter says: "If such diseases are communicated by contact the oil itself protects from the transmission of the virus." With all deference, however, to the learned doctor, I understand it is very questionable whether one can rely upon the antiseptic quality of the oil to this extent. "In the majority of contagious diseases," continues the eminent doctor above quoted, "no actual contact is required for their communication, as the contagious matter appears to be transmissible by the air."

4. The Last Blessing.—We come now to our final subject for consideration, the Last Blessing *in articulo mortis*. Here two points call for notice: the invocation of the Holy Name of Jesus, and the repetition of the said blessing.

Although the necessity of the invocation of the Holy Name for the validity of the last blessing was at one time much controverted, it is now certain that its invocation, mentally or orally, is a *sine qua non* condition of its valid reception. The decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences has settled this question: "Invocatio saltem mentalis SSmi Nominis Jesu est conditio sine qua non pro universis Christifidelibus qui in mortis articulo constituti plenariam indulgentiam assequi volunt vi hujus Benedictionis."[6] Wherefore if a dying man be absolutely unconscious, and not able, orally or mentally, to invoke the Holy Name, the indulgence is not gained. Practically speaking, however, the blessing should always be given, since the dying person *may* be able to invoke the Holy Name mentally, though apparently totally unconscious.

It will be seen from the quotation given below that the last blessing is not repeated, even though the patient be in mortal sin at the time it is imparted, or if a mortal sin be committed by the recipient of the said blessing after it has been given, it being sufficient that the state of grace be recovered; nor again is it repeated when a priest may lawfully readminister Extreme Unction in a case of protracted illness. The general rule is that the last blessing is repeated only when the priest ought to reanoint, *i. e.*, when after recovery the danger of death returns. In hospitals it is always prudent to give the last blessing immediately after the anointing; otherwise a patient is in danger of losing the last blessing altogether.

I am aware that many priests make a practice of giving the last blessing in the same sickness, and for the purpose of making the application of the blessing more certainly valid. Although there is no necessity for this, it would appear from the quotation I here subjoin, and to which I have just alluded, that it is no way wrong to do so. "Indulgentia plenaria ex benedictione Papali *in vero*

[6] S. Cong. of Indulgences, Sept. 23, 1775; Sept. 22, 1892.

articulo mortis et quidem *una* tantum a moriente pro se acquiritur; ideo aliae pro animabus defunctorum non lucrifiunt. Hinc in eadem permanente infirmitate licet diuturna eam semel tantum impertiri licet, etsi infirmus eam accepit in statu peccati mortalis aut post acceptionem in peccatum relapsus est aut absolutionem vel etiam extremam unctionem iterum accepit. Ratio, cur prohibitum est, eadem infirmitate permanente benedictionem Papalem pluries impertiri juxta Resp. S. C. Ind. 12 Martii 1855, n. 362, in quo refertur ad Resp. die 5 Feb. 1841, n. 286, est, quia in eodem articulo mortis infirmus indulgentiam semel tantum lucrari potest. Unde si a moribundo, non ex intentione indulgentiam pluries lucrandi, benedictio Papalis pluries peteretur aut a sacerdote daretur, sed ex alia e. g. ad effectum securiorem reddendum aut si pluries conferetur ad excitandos pios effectus ad certius procurandam pro indulgentia dispositionem, nihil fieret contra decreta. Ita *Il Mon. Eccl.*, vol. viii, part. 2, pag. 110 cum Melata (Manuale de Indulgentiis, part. 2, sec. Qu. 1, C. 1, art. 2). Praesertim cum tali intentione pluries benedictio Papalis dari potest moribundo, si hic ad eam ex pluribus titulis jus haberet, prout, testante Melata, etiam nunc Romae practicatur."[7]

It only remains for me in concluding this paper to observe that, while the noble and self-sacrificing life of the hospital chaplain involves many arduous duties repugnant to human nature, many anxieties and dangers, it is one, nevertheless, that is crowned with consolations, natural as well as supernatural. The tokens of joy and peace, and the thrilling conviction of security which his spiritual ministrations inspire in the anguish-stricken soul of the dying sufferer, were stimulus enough; but the deep gratitude that wells from his heart, gleams in his eye, and trembles on his lips, is to the priestly ministrant a priceless legacy.

ALFRED MANNING MULLIGAN.

Birmingham, England.

[7] *Konings-Putzer, Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas*, Ed. quarta, 1897, p. 258; Cf. *Analecta Eccl.*, 1894, pag. 131, 225

PROMULGATION OF THE GENERAL JUBILEE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

THE Encyclical, *Temporis quidem sacri*, published in this issue of the REVIEW, announces the extension throughout the Catholic world of the Jubilee Indulgence which was proclaimed for the Eternal City last year. Accordingly the faithful everywhere are privileged to gain, during the space of six months, the Plenary Indulgence of the general Jubilee. This applies to all Catholics without exception, even to those who have already gained the Indulgence, either by visiting Rome last year, or by otherwise fulfilling the prescribed conditions in their own exempted localities, such as religious in convents, the aged and infirm in asylums, etc.

The conditions imposed for the present extension of the Holy Year Indulgence are as follows:

1. To make at least one visit daily, for fifteen days, to four churches designated by the Ordinary or his Vicars, including the cathedral for those dwelling in the cathedral city, and the principal church in the larger cities, and to pray there for the triumph of Holy Church, the extirpation of false doctrine, the concord of Christian princes, and the salvation of the people.

2. In places where there are less than four churches the Ordinaries are to designate the church or churches to be visited for the gaining of the Indulgence. In this case the number of visits is to be equivalent to that prescribed for the cities, namely, sixty visits to be made during fifteen days.

3. The time for computing the beginning of the Jubilee for six months is the day in each diocese on which the document of the Holy Father is officially published by the Ordinary of the diocese.

4. Where there are four churches in a city designated by the Ordinary for the gaining of the Jubilee, these four must be visited once on the same day for fifteen days; the fifteen days need not be in succession; but where there is a less number the visits may be made at any time, provided there be sixty visits made during fifteen days, either successively or at intervals.

5. The days may be computed either from sunrise to sunset

of the same day, or from first vespers of one day to sunset of the next day, which latter is the ecclesiastical day. This has the advantage of enabling a person living in the city to make five or even eight visits on any one day, by completing four visits during part of the natural day (between sunrise and 2 o'clock P.M., the hour for Vespers), and then, after leaving the last visited church, by entering it again to begin the four visits for the next day (ecclesiastical day).

6. Sorrow for sin, a good confession, and the reception of Holy Communion are essential requisites for the gaining of the Indulgence. The Easter Confession and Communion is a distinct obligation which does satisfy for the gaining of the Indulgence.

There are certain exemptions accorded in the following cases:

1. Persons who, by reason of a long journey, are prevented from making the Jubilee within the prescribed time, may, on arriving at their homes or other fixed stations after the expiration of the six months, gain the Indulgence by visiting the principal church of the place fifteen times.

2. Religious and persons living in convents or institutions following a community life, prisoners, invalids, and those prevented by other legitimate reasons from making the required visits, may be dispensed by the Ordinary of the diocese.

In such cases the bishop or those empowered by him shall have the right to commute into some other works of piety and devotion the ordinary obligations of the Jubilee.

This the Ordinary may do through appointed confessors or ecclesiastical officials, either in or outside the confessional.

Children who have not made their First Communion may gain the Indulgence by performing such other works as the Ordinary prescribes for them.

The Ordinary has likewise the right to reduce the number of regular visits to the churches for members of sodalities, confraternities, congregations, universities, colleges, schools, and parishes, who, under the guidance of their pastor, or some one deputed by him for the purpose, visit the appointed churches *in procession* or in a body.

CONFESSORS.

With regard to confessors and their special faculties for the Jubilee, the following general privileges are granted:

1. Nuns, including novices, may choose any confessor they like for the Jubilee confession, provided the confessor has the faculty of hearing confessions in the diocese.

2. All the faithful, whether regular or secular, ecclesiastic or lay, shall have the right to select their confessors from any Order or place, provided such confessors are approved by the Ordinary for hearing confessions in the diocese, or who (in the case of religious choosing a confessor of their own Order) have the approbation of the superior of the Order to which they belong.

3. These confessors have the faculty, as long as the Jubilee extension lasts, to absolve (*in foro conscientiae*) from excommunication, suspension, and other ecclesiastical sentences and censures, even such as are ordinarily reserved to the bishop, or to the Holy See, with the understanding that they enjoin a salutary penance upon the penitent claiming absolution.

Only priests who have given absolution, thrice or oftener, to an accomplice *in crimine complicis*, are excluded from this concession.

Those who have publicly promulgated false doctrines of faith are obliged to repair publicly the scandal given, before they can receive absolution. Apart from ordinary cases of restitution the present Indult mentions that those who have stolen sacred property must make restitution or sincerely promise to do so as soon as they are able, before they can receive absolution.

4. The appointed confessors have the faculty to commute vows, even such as are reserved to the Holy See, into other pious works; also to dispense from occult irregularities forbidding the exercise of or promotion to higher Sacred Orders, in cases which have not been (or are likely to be) brought before the ecclesiastical court.

In this faculty are not included the vows of perpetual chastity, or the triple vows made in religious communities, or such as affect the rights of third parties, or such as have been made for the purpose of preventing probable sin (called *poenales* or *prae-*

servativa a peccato), unless the works enjoined in the last-mentioned case have equally the effect of restraining from sin.

5. Confessors have the faculty, moreover, of dispensing (*pro foro conscientiae*) from the impediment of marriages illegally contracted in the second and third degree, or in the third degree alone, or in the third and fourth degree, or in the fourth degree alone of consanguinity or of affinity (*etiam ex copula licita provenientis*), provided the impediment remains occult.

6. In like manner, confessors may dispense (*pro foro conscientiae tantum*) from the occult diriment impediment in the first and second degree, or the first or second degree alone, of affinity arising *ex copula illicita;* not only in the case of a marriage actually contracted, but if there be sufficiently grave reasons for contracting marriage. Not included in this faculty is the case of affinity which arises "ex copula cum matre desponsatae vel desponsandae, si hujus nativitas copulam antecesserit."

7. Confessors may likewise dispense (*pro foro conscientiae*) from the impediment of spiritual relationship; also from the occult *impedimentum criminis, neutro tamen machinante*, when there is adultery together with the promise of future marriage after the death of the obnoxious party.

Similar faculties are granted under Numbers 8 and 9 of the text, which it is unnecessary to detail here.

The Holy Father distinctly declares, however, that the power to dispense does not affect other irregularities or defects, not mentioned in the foregoing concession; nor does it give power to absolve the "complex in inhonesto contra sextum Praeceptum," or allow any accomplice to select such a confessor with the view of obtaining absolution. Persons who are nominally excommunicated, suspended, interdicted, or otherwise publicly censured by legitimate ecclesiastical authority, cannot obtain absolution without having made due satisfaction as prescribed, and within the time allotted for the gaining of the Jubilee Indulgence.

10. Persons who, having begun the Jubilee visits with a view of completing them, but who are prevented by sickness from doing so, may gain the Indulgence if they are truly penitent, go to confession, and receive Holy Communion.

THE REFORMATION AND EDUCATION. (1520–1648.)

WITH the accession of Nicholas V to the throne of St. Peter, in the year 1447, the golden age of the Renaissance began. The spirit no less than the principles of Humanism had been long at work. Even under the two preceding reigns of Martin V and Eugenius IV, they are beheld actively engaged winning advocates and making foes and laying deep the foundations of the mighty changes which were so soon to follow, but of which few, if any, at the time had the remotest suspicion. Himself a humanist and a great patron of letters, Nicholas was alive to the necessity of reviving a learning, which, rightly understood, could not fail to serve a valuable religious and moral as well as intellectual purpose. Acting upon this conviction, he exerted from the outset the full force of his personal influence and official prestige to make Rome, and with it the Church, the great controlling centre of the new forces coming into play. Every encouragement was given to proficiency in the various departments of literature, science, and art. Preferments and rewards were lavishly bestowed. The corners of the earth were ransacked for manuscripts and tomes with which to stock the Vatican library, which his munificence had founded; and for monuments and antiquities of all sorts with which to grace the public roads and gardens and buildings of the Eternal City. Money was no consideration in the face of evident needs, and the comprehensive views of one whose appreciation took in at a single glance and with equal facility the dirt-begrimed fragment of some long-lost classic and the architectural proportions of St. Peter's, which he was the first to conceive and plan as a substitute for the venerable but inartistic and crumbling basilica of Constantine. As water seeks its level, as the needle seeks the pole, so genius instinctively seeks the company of genius; and it is no matter of surprise to find that under such favorable influences, fostered, with little interruption, for well-nigh a century, Christian learning should have flowered to its mightiest in the immortal personages of an Angelo, a Raphael, a Titian, or a Fra Angelico. Painting and sculpture and architecture thrilled to a new life. In literature especially was the progress marked. The classics, Greek, Latin, Arabic,

and Hebrew, were sought out, translated, pondered, and imitated. Prose works were multiplied. Poetry in particular was carried to a marvelous degree of refinement in the case of some, the music of whose rhythmic productions still sounds like a lost chord caught from the majestic harmonies of a Virgil, a Theocritus, or a Homer. Poggio, Valla, and Alberti; Guarino, Aurispa, and Filelfo; Pomponius Laetus, Sylvius, and Platina; Tortello and Decembrio, not to mention others, are names immediately suggestive of a literary polish the like of which the world had never seen on such a magnificent scale since the days of Pericles and Augustus. All in all, this revival, so popular and so rapid, was a widespread one, whose growth, upon the lines sanctioned by Nicholas and not a few of his successors, would have led in due season to incalculable and none but beneficial results.

Was the movement an altogether new one? No. Its brilliant development under Nicholas and, later, its culmination under Leo X, were but the far-off results of a process of intellectual industry and assimilation which had been going on for generations. In the Universities of Bologna and Salermo, and the monastic retreat of Le Bec—the birthplaces, respectively, of legal, medical, and theological science in the Western world—we behold the first and feeble dawnings of a reaction breaking through the darkness and stagnation of centuries. The great scholastic agitation, with its endless and acrimonious controversies, seemed for a while to divert interest and attention from it into other channels. But with the fall of Constantinople (1453), and the consequent influx of Greek thought and language into Europe, it took on a newer and still more ardent life, and once again, from out the distant past, evoked the genius of Petrarch and Boccaccio, its brightest offsprings and highest exponents. Under Nicholas the Renaissance was fully under way, understanding by the term, of course, not an absolute re-birth of literary and artistic sense, for such it was not, but the creation of a boundless zest and marvelous grace and finish in concept and execution. "Taken absolutely," says Guizot, "and as implying a Renaissance following upon a decay of science, literature, and art, the expression is exaggerated and goes beyond the truth; it is not true that the five centuries which rolled by between the establishment of the Capetians

and the accession of Francis I (987–1515) were a period of intellectual barrenness and decay; the Middle Ages, amidst the anarchy, violence, and calamities of their social condition, had in philosophy, literature, and art works of their own and a glory of their own which lacked not originality, or brilliancy, or influence over subsequent ages."[1] Begun in Italy, the movement was not slow in making itself felt in other countries of Europe. Scholars from Germany, France, Spain, and the Netherlands, from everywhere, in fact, flocked to the banks of the Tiber to become imbued with the principles of that advanced culture which was to affect so largely the educational no less than the sociological destinies of the world.

But, like most good things, it had to be abused. Many, mistaking its purpose, and betrayed by the seductiveness of paganism, sought in it the gratification born of the purely material and sensual. The rich mines of ancient lore, which were now being opened up, were traversed by them, not so much for their priceless charms of thought and word, as for the shocking obscenities in which they abounded. It thus chanced that, side by side with the Christian Renaissance, there stole into existence a stream of heathen tendency, which deepened and widened as the years lapsed, and did so much to prepare the world for the catastrophe of the sixteenth century. It was discernible in the reign of Nicholas and earlier, but was kept under control, as it had not yet assumed the strength which it was so soon to acquire. What was faulty in the movement the Church emphatically condemned and from the start. Individuals here and individuals there, it is true, some of them even high in her councils and entrusted with the administration of her affairs, deceived by the factitious charms of a false beauty and a belying taste, connived too much at what more delicate consciences instinctively shunned. But the Church as such never did and never could affix the seal of her sanction to a spirit that not only was not hers, but was destined to become the baneful source of so many of her woes, and her relentless enemy throughout all time. It has been said that the Renaissance period in Italy was "the classical age of conspiracies and

[1] *History of France*, Vol. VII, c. 29, p. 143. Edit. 1874. 8 vols.

tyrannicides." It was not long before the truth of this saying was brought home to the Church's own doors. Nicholas V, and after him Paul II, were made to realize the fact in the precautions which it became necessary for them to take against the contemplated attacks upon their lives and temporal sovereignty. The conspiracy of Stefano Porcaro (1453) and that of Platina (1464), not to speak of the wholesale demoralization which they and their pagan confederates had wrought, were indication enough of the logical trend of the new heathenism and its irreconcilability with the teachings of Christianity. Stringent measures eventually became necessary, and stringent measures were adopted. The power of the Papacy, and even that of the secular arm, were invoked to stem the evil, without, however, shackling the movement in so far as it was good and praiseworthy.

A Catholic reaction thus set in, which succeeded in driving it from the ranks of Catholicism, where it was out of place, to those of Protestantism, with which at the beginning it seemed to have found a natural ally. We say "at the beginning," for, before long, they parted company in the persons of Luther and Hutten. Though at one in their hatred of scholasticism and Rome, the heathenism of the humanists could ill brook the fragments of Catholic truth to which the Reformers still clung; while the unæsthetic temperament of Luther and his positive antipathy to higher studies more than shocked the sensibilities and aspirations of the New Learning and gave rise to the well-known saying of Erasmus, the prince of Humanism—"*Ubicumque regnat Lutheranismus, ibi Litterarum est interitus.*" Nor was the Renaissance alone in its warfare upon purity and truth. It found an ally in the spirit of intellectual pride and rebellious scepticism, as old as it was contumacious, and as destructive as it was treacherous. We meet with an early manifestation of it at the court of Charles the Bald (A. D. 840), in the person of Scotus Erigena, whose heresies the Church was forced to condemn. It cropped up again in Berengarius and Abelard—in the Albigenses—the Hussites and the Lollards, and became world-wide, so to speak, at the time of the Western Schism, as any one familiar with the history of the Councils of Constance and Basle and the defiant spirit of the times will immediately recall. Thus sensuality and pride went hand in

hand to meet the Reformation, which welcomed them both and bodied forth their cardinal principles in its gospel of Rationalism and Naturalism. When we read the story of the Reformation and philosophize upon the destructive character of some of its pet principles, such as the right of private judgment, total depravity, and justification by faith alone, we marvel that they should have met with such ready acceptance at the hands, not merely of individuals, but even of entire nations. There is no reason, however, to marvel, if we bear in mind that people, as individuals, reap what they sow, and that the sixteenth century was but the harvest of which the fourteenth and fifteenth had been the spring-tide and the summer-time.

But what, it will be asked, has all this got to do with education? An immense deal. It is the keynote of the Reformation, and must be sounded as a prelude, if we would understand aright either the philosophy of that discordant epoch, or the history of education from that day to this. So popular did this sceptical, this heathenish revival become, and so bold, that its success was as pronounced as it was regrettable. As early as 1520, it had permeated nearly all the great universities and schools of secondary education throughout Italy and elsewhere, especially in Germany. The spirit grew, and its attitude, whether in the daily walks of student life, or upon the professor's chair, was one of revolt against custom, authority, and tradition. Everything in the literary and artistic, and, as far as possible, in the social order, was to be revolutionized, that the Rome of the Popes might be metamorphosed into that of the Cæsars. Classical Latin had to be substituted for Church Latin. Chairs of Roman and Grecian literature and language were founded. Greek was incorporated in the Department of Arts. Scholasticism was scouted as a mere network of dialectical refinings as endless as they were useless. The intellectual giants of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—writers of the tremendous calibre of Duns Scotus, Albertus Magnus, and Aquinas —were ridiculed as out of date and place, and that, too, by a tribe of dilettanti, with whom literary snobbery and affectation were but too frequently mistaken for culture and sound sense. The writings of the early Fathers, of Jerome, and Augustine, and Chrysostom, were set down as crude and altogether at variance

with the canons of reformed classical taste. Plato, whom they particularly affected, and Aristotle might be tolerated, if shorn of the barbarous Latin jargon in which they had been cast. Even the Bible had become tedious, and was far from being as interesting as Cicero, Cæsar, or Quintus Curtius. The Church herself, with her priesthood, her Orders, her ceremonial, her symbolical life, her theology, and her discipline, had grown intolerably monotonous. There was but one desideratum, and that was the complete reinthronement of pagan thought, morals, and manners. It is not difficult to imagine what effect such a radical spirit, working through two hundred years, must have had in the lecture-hall and school-room, into which it forced itself early, and where it was holding high carnival when the summons to revolt was sounded. Nor were its effects to be short-lived. As we have remarked, it was to live on even after the Reformation had practically become a thing of the past, and leave its impress upon the whole subsequent political and social character of European life and thought, manifesting itself nowhere more emphatically and with sadder results than in the field of pedagogics. It has tainted the educational policy of the non-Catholic world ever since. It lives and breathes in the so-called systems which have multiplied so profusely within the last few hundred years. We meet with it in the theories of Sturm, Ratisch, Franke, and Comenius; in that of the Port-Royalists; in those of Basedow, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Jacotot. It is painfully discernible in Rousseau and Rabelais, Montaigne and Milton, Arnold and Herbart, and other speculators upon the subject. Its darker influence is traceable in the background of what is so often improperly styled "the philosophy of education," from the sensism of John Locke to the utilitarianism of Alexander Bain, or the agnosticism of Mr. Herbert Spencer. And it lives, not as an accidental concomitant either, but as the soul and centre of views which *have* played and *are* playing no small part in the intellectual evolution of the world. But if the spirit of the heathen Renaissance survived, and is still surviving, that of the Christian has not been less vital. It also has bequeathed a heritage to posterity. Bravely has it struggled through good and evil report, and to-day, as centuries ago, furnishes the world with the principles which alone can harmonize, in a perfect concept, the good, the beautiful, and the true.

We often hear it said, and with an astonishing air of triumph, particularly by special pleaders of the stamp of D'Aubigné and Michelet, that the pre-Reformation period was dark beyond description. There was a deplorable lack of educational facilities and of intellectual culture, so we are told. It was not till Luther shed the light of his transcendent genius upon the world that it awoke to that appreciation of knowledge and of scientific investigation which has since proved the secret of its phenomenal advance. This, however, is mere assumption and talk. Honest Protestant writers have long since realized it, with the result that a perceptible change has been wrought in the critical character of modern historical research. The facts are briefly these. They speak for themselves and are above suspicion, as they have been gathered in the main from exclusively non-Catholic sources. At the time of Luther's secession, in 1520, there were in Europe 72 universities, all of them Catholic, of course, distributed as follows: 20 in France, 15 in Germany, 15 in Italy, 7 in Spain, 3 in Scotland, 2 in Austria, Switzerland, and England respectively, and one in Belgium, Portugal, Poland, Hungary, Denmark, and Sweden. Around most of these universities, notably those of Paris, Bologna, Oxford, Cambridge, Padua, Pavia, Vienna, Prague, Louvain, and later Alcala, a system of schools and colleges had been developed. They filled so evident a want that they multiplied rapidly. Paris had over 60; Louvain 40; Oxford, inclusive of Halls, over 300, and so on. In the vicinity of these same universities the various religious Orders and Congregations—Benedictines, Dominicans, Carmelites, Cistercians, Franciscans, Augustinians, Trinitarians, Premonstratensians, and others had established houses of study for their own members—a custom which we already meet with in the eighth century, and which in the thirteenth had become general. In the same localities the bishops had erected seminaries for the advanced training of aspirants to the diocesan priesthood. In the shadow of nearly every episcopal residence stood a cathedral school or little seminary, where youths received, under the eye of the Ordinary, a preliminary ecclesiastical training. In every parish, in well-nigh every village, parochial schools were flourishing. There were thirty such schools for girls alone in Paris as early as the fourteenth century. And

be it remembered that these schools had been established, not at the option of the clergy, but by a series of synodical ordinations stretching from the sixth to the sixteenth century. The Council of Vaison in 529; that of Mayence in 800; that of Rome in 826; the Third Council of Lateran in 1179; and that of Lyons in 1215, were amongst those that framed decrees on the subject, not only providing education for the masses, but supplying it *gratis*, and thus anticipating the modern free school idea by nearly fifteen centuries.

Moreover, Europe was peopled with monasteries. In England, at the time of the dissolution, not to mention others, there were 114 Cistercian, 65 Franciscan, and 58 Dominican monasteries. Most of them had schools for day scholars and boarders attached, some of which were quite advanced and are still celebrated as such in the history of those times. So great was the zest for learning that in many of them, as Venerable Bede narrates of Yarrow, the children of the poorest were not only educated free of charge, but were housed, fed, and clothed at the expense of the cloister. "They (the monasteries) were schools of learning and education; for every convent had one person or more appointed for this purpose; and all the neighbors that desired it might have their children taught grammar and Church music without any expense to them. In the nunneries also young women were taught to work and to read English, and sometimes Latin also. So that not only the lower rank of people who could not pay for their learning, but most of the noblemen's and gentlemen's daughters were educated in those places."[2] Nor were the parochial and monastic schools the only provision made for primary and secondary education. The Hieronymites or Gregorians or "Brothers of the Common Life," as they are usually designated, founded by Gerard Groote or Gerard the Great, in 1384, were active in the cause of Catholic education, and bore no little "resemblance," says the Protestant Buckingham, "to the Christian Brothers of our day." They spread rapidly through Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, France, and Flanders, and counted on their roll of tutors many of exceptional ability, such as Alexander Hegius, John

[2] *Notitia Monastica*, Tanner. Quoted from "A History of the Reformation in England and Ireland." C. IV. Cobbett.

Cochlaeus, and Jacob Wimpheling, surnamed the "educator of Germany." At Zwolle they had 800 pupils; at Atmaar 900; at Hertzogenbusch 1,200, and at Deventer, in the year 1500, 2,200 under instruction. For more than half a century before the Reformation they had utilized the art of printing to put the treasures of classical literature within easy reach of students. In their colleges they taught Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and mathematics. In their elementary schools, reading, writing, catechism, and certain mechanical arts, the early adumbration of that industrial training which De La Salle was to carry to such perfection in after years, and which the nineteenth century would try to assume as the almost exclusive product of its own unparalleled enlightenment. There were, in addition, Chantries and Chaptral schools. Education in these latter was not always free, which rendered them doubtless a whit more select. We meet with them at Courtrai, Namur, Ghent, Antwerp, Ypres, and elsewhere. There were eleven of them in Brussels in 1320—"one superior for each sex, four primary for girls, and five primary for boys." Add to these the communal schools conducted at the public expense and in operation in Holland as early as the thirteenth century. Besides there was the endowed school in villages and poorer districts. "The endowments," says Leach, "were confiscated by the State (at the Reformation), and many still line the pockets of the descendants of the statesmen of those days."[3] Moreover, convent schools were numerous and in charge of Benedictine, Dominican, Franciscan, and Beguin nuns. Finally, private "adventure schools," either resident or shifting from place to place as the wandering propensities or pecuniary necessities of the pedagogue in charge might suggest or demand. Pupils flocked to those mediæval schools in multitudes that seem almost fabulous by contrast with the meagre attendance upon our modern universities and colleges. Giants like Scotus, Aquinas, and Albert the Great lectured in their halls. Amongst their students we meet with geniuses and polite scholars like Dante, Chaucer, Roger Bacon, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Thomas of Canterbury, More, Pole, Erasmus, Fisher, John of Salisbury, Thomas à Kempis and his famous protégé

[3] "School Supply in the Middle Ages." *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 66.

Rudolph Agricola, styled, even by the Italians, the Virgil of Germany. Historical characters like Dominic, Bonaventure, and Francis of Assisi, were identified with their progress. The monuments of learning which still fill our libraries, the product of those ages and which have never been approached, much less equalled, in breadth and profundity, are irrefutable witnesses to the high order of mental cultivation then in vogue. Not to mention an endless array of theological and philosophical works, the Complutensian Polyglot of Ximenez, edited in 1502, including the Chaldaic, Hebraic, Greek, and Latin versions of Holy Writ, is of itself sufficient proof of the boundless research and critical acumen of the day.

"There is no question," says Huber, the German historian of the English universities, and a Protestant, "that during the Middle Ages the English universities were distinguished, *far more than afterwards*, by energy and variety of intellect. . . . Later times cannot produce a concentration of men eminent in all the learning and science of their age such as Oxford and Cambridge then poured forth, mightily influencing the intellectual development of all Western Christendom."[4] "There is not the smallest doubt," says Mr. Arthur Leach, also a Protestant and a recognized authority, "that the provision for *secondary education* was far greater in proportion to population during the Middle Ages than it has ever been since. . . . From the university to the village school every educational institution was an ecclesiastical one, and those who governed it, managed it, and taught it, were ecclesiastics. Every village parson was, or ought to have been, an elementary schoolmaster; every collegiate church kept a secondary school, and every cathedral church maintained in early days a small university. . . . The result was, that as the Church was ubiquitous, so education was in some form ubiquitous, if not universal. As a consequence, secondary schools were found in almost every place in which they were required."[5] "In any case," he continues, "the contrast between one grammar school to every 5,625 people, and that presented by the Schools' Inquiry Report (1867) of one to every 23,750 people, is not

[4] *History of the English Universities*, Vol. I, c. 3. Italics ours.

[5] *Loc. cit.* Italics ours.

flattering to ourselves. In regard to secondary education we cannot justly echo the Homeric boast that we are much better than our forefathers."[6] He says again: "We are not here concerned with *elementary* education, but it is certain that it was well provided for." "Long before the Reformation," says Barnard, speaking of Scotland, "all the principal towns had grammar schools, in which the Latin language was taught; besides which they had 'lecture schools' in which children were instructed to read the vernacular tongue."

In spite of this and much more that might be quoted, even from Protestant sources, we are gravely informed that it was Luther who let in light upon this worse than cimmerian darkness. His coming was the day-spring breaking upon the night of centuries and liberating men from an intellectual thraldom to which they had been subjected for years. The statement is a gross burlesque upon the truth, and would be laughable but for the tragic associations which it conjures up. If he accomplished so much as an educational reformer, it certainly should not be difficult to arrive at the secret of his wonderful success. Was it due perhaps to the encouragement which he gave to educational enterprises? No. His work in this respect, as we shall see, was one of demolition and not of construction. Was it because he was the founder of popular education? No. From what has been said, it is evident that he was no more the founder of popular education than Julius Cæsar was the inventor of the telescope or Nabuchodonosor of the steam engine. Popular education was centuries old before he was born. When he came, schools abounded in nearly every city, town, and village. He himself attended one of them for a year at Mansfeld at the age of fourteen, going thence to another at Magdeburg, and later for four years to Eisenach, in the vicinity of his native place, Eisleben, in which town there were three churches, to each of which a school was attached. His advanced studies were made at the University of Erfurt, from which he took his degree of Master of Arts in 1505. We are told that as a student his favorites among the classics were Cicero, Livy, Virgil, and Plautus, which shows incidentally that in the depart-

[6] *Loc. cit.*

ment of belles-lettres some at least of the schools of those days were quite up to the standard. Was it by the translation and dissemination of the Bible in the vernacular? No. For seventy editions of the Bible had been printed and put into circulation before his appeared in 1530. Of these, twenty were in the German language. Was it due possibly to the profound character of his writings? No. Nothing was more foreign to his works than depth. So lacking, in fact, were they in mental equipoise and logical clear-sightedness that they soon became the fruitful source of religious contradictions and disputes. His writings abound in what Schlegel has aptly designated "barbaro-polemic eloquence." Hallam speaks of certain of his treatises as mere "bellowing in bad Latin," and adds that while we cannot fail to notice and be disgusted by "their intemperance, their coarseness, their inelegance, their scurrility, their wild paradoxes, that menace the foundations of religious morality," "the clear and comprehensive line of argument which enlightens the reader's understanding and resolves his difficulties is always wanting."[7] Was it that he was the first to unite religion and education? No. That had been done from the outset by the early monks, and prior to them even by the hermits in the desert. Prayer, ceremony, psalmody, and divine service had always been a portion of every student's daily life. In what then did he reform education? In absolutely nothing. "There was not," says Stockl, "a single pedagogical principle in all the teachings of the Reformation." Luther was in no sense a reformer, but in every sense a rebel. It may even be said, and history bears out the statement, that the chaotic exhibition of devastation and frenzy which accident has nick-named a "reformation," was due less to the individual qualities of the man than to the distrait temper of the times. The spirit of scepticism and the spirit of the heathen Renaissance, operating in concert for two centuries and more, had impregnated the social mass with the germs of dissolution and rebellion. Nothing was needed to bring them to life and light but a sanction, and that sanction they found in certain extravagant and subversive principles which it required one utterly devoid of Christian instinct to formulate

[7] *Introduction to the Literature of Europe.* Vol. I, pp. 197, 198.

and defend. Such a one was forthcoming in Martin Luther; and as we follow the destructive course of the work which he inaugurated, sweeping with the dread effect of the simoon over Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, and the Netherlands—and later throughout England, Ireland, Scotland, and France, we cannot but reëcho the half plaintive, half caustic lament of Erasmus: "*Ubicumque regnat Lutheranismus, ibi Litterarum est interitus.*"

Even if no direct attack had been made upon its educational interests, the fact that Germany had been for over a century the battlefield of contending parties would be sufficient explanation of the rapid decline in learning which afflicted that country in consequence of the Reformation. But a very direct and prolonged attack was made. Luther and his confrères, in their rabid denunciation of the Church and of the schools conducted by her, as all the schools at that time were, struck a blow at education, whose sorrowful results they themselves would realize and deplore when too late. In consequence of the widespread disorder, the common schools in Saxony, Brandenburg, Hanau-Münzenburg, Weimar, Brunswick, Pomerania, Hesse, Würtemberg, Waldeck, Lippe, Oldenburg, Pyrmont, and Nassau almost totally disappeared. In 1528, schools for girls had ceased to exist in the Electorate of Saxony. Joachim Camerarius, a disciple and intimate friend of Melanchthon, was one of the first to bewail the sad decay of all scholarship in Germany. In 1536 he wrote to Luther: "I frequently wonder, in view of this destruction of all morality and this growing dissoluteness of life, whether it were not better to be deprived of public schools altogether, than to have institutions which seem to exist for no other purpose than to foster sin and dissipation." In another letter, written some years later (1550) to a friend, he says: "It is evident that everything has combined for the destruction of Germany, and that religion, science, modesty, and morality must suffer extinction." Even in those portions which remained faithful to the Church, the effect was disastrous, and the district schools of Austria and Bavaria, with few exceptions, sank to a low level, and in most cases were eventually discontinued. The Gymnasia of Nürnberg, Basle, Strasburg, and Julich declined rapidly. The Latin school of Freiburg almost

disappeared. Apropos of the situation, King Ferdinand I, in 1562, wrote to the Council of Trent: "In the German gymnasia," he says, "one can now hardly find as many pupils, counting all together, as *formerly* frequented a single one of these institutions. In place of 300 or 400 students who formerly attended one of them, we find hardly more than 20 or 30. In the higher institutions of learning, in place of 1,000 we now have 300, or, at most, 400 students;" while Luther, at a much earlier date, in 1524, four years after the outbreak, writing to the Burgomasters and Councils of the cities of Germany, had this to say: "The high-grade schools are becoming weak. . . . Where convents are done away with, people will no longer allow their children either to study or be taught."[8] And this picture of the primary and secondary schools was reproduced on a much larger scale in the case of the universities. A few facts quoted from Janssen and Doellinger will suffice to show this. The ancient University of Prague, so celebrated in its day, and which, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, could boast 60,000 students, had in 1550 dwindled to 8 professors and 30 pupils. That of Vienna, which in 1519 matriculated 661 students, in 1532 received only 12. That of Cologne, where 2,000 pupils had been the regular attendance from 1500 to 1510, in 1534 had 54. The University of Erfurt, Luther's "Alma Mater," and where, we might easily presume, the light of his educational reform shone brightest, had in 1521 only 311 pupils, and in 1527 sank to 14. Freiburg in 1617 had 78 pupils. The professors of the University of Heidelberg were forced to resign their chairs and seek a livelihood in some other direction, as the institution had neither funds nor pupils. In like manner, the universities of Rostock and Greifswald became mendicant. Indeed, the complaint was general that in all the universities the professors were insufficiently paid. Add to this the degenerate moral tone which then prevailed in most of the German universities. Murder, drunkenness, robbery, and every species of ribaldry reigned amongst the professors as amongst the students, notoriously so in the University of Ingolstadt, where,

[8] For numerous similar facts, *cf.* "History of the German People Since the Close of the Middle Ages." Janssen. Vol. VII. Also, "The Reformation." Doellinger. Vol. I.

in 1531, no one could be found, owing to its turbulent condition, to assume the management. A similar state of things prevailed at the universities of Freiburg (1592), Frankfort, Marburg, Leipsic, Königsberg, Basle, Jena, Tübingen, and especially Wittenberg. In such an atmosphere, not only the humanistic studies, as Luther, Melanchthon, and Erasmus confessed and deplored, fell into utter disregard, but theology, philosophy, law, medicine, scripture, history, and the natural sciences suffered irreparably. Philology, with no end of controversial wrangling, characterized by temper instead of penetration, was the main business of the schools. Paulsen, professor of philosophy and philology in the University of Berlin, and an unimpeachable witness, in his work upon German universities, has this to say upon our subject: "In the fearful tumults between 1520 and 1530, the (German) universities and schools came to almost a complete standstill, and with the Church fell the institutions of learning which she had brought forth."[9] Again: "At the close of this epoch (1525–1700) the universities in Germany had fallen to the lowest degree of influence and fame. They appeared as superannuated and almost degenerated institutions in comparison with the progressive culture which had its centre at the princely courts. A man like Leibnitz refused to accept a position in a university; he preferred the princely court, where he was sure to find comprehension and promotion of his ideas and extensive plans. The universities were almost without any perceptible influence upon the life and the thoughts of the pupils." "Drinking and quarrelling (*saufen und raufen*) were not only related to each other in rhyme, but flourished to such an extent in the middle of the seventeenth century, that serious steps had to be taken on the part of the State authorities to gradually reëstablish some semblance of order."[10] The educational condition of affairs in Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, and the Netherlands was much the same. Sad as the facts are, they are all that could be expected from the reform principles in vogue. Individualism, as set forth in the doctrine of private interpretation, struck at the very root of law and order. As a consequence of endless theological disputes, parishes lost all interest in

[9] *German Universities.* C. II. Historical Development.
[10] *Loc. cit.*

the work of education. Preachers and teachers fell into disrepute, and where they should have commanded respect became a by-word and reproach. Monasteries were deserted or closed and their foundations and gratuities seized by greedy princes. So precarious did the outlook for education in Germany become, that the State had to assume the control of the free universities to keep them alive, and "Cæsaro-Papacy" was again reinstated with what lamentable results to religion and society the sequel has made painfully evident.

EUGENE MAGEVNEY, S.J.

St. Ignatius' College, Chicago, Ill.

[To be continued.]

Analecta.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XIII

CONSTITUTIO APOSTOLICA

DE RELIGIOSORUM INSTITUTIS VOTA SIMPLICIA PROFITENTIUM.

LEO EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM

Conditae a Christo Ecclesiae ea vis divinitus inest ac fecunditas, ut multas anteactis temporibus, plurimas aetate hac elabente utriusque sexus tamquam familias ediderit, quae, sacro *votorum simplicium* suscepto vinculo, sese variis religionis et misericordiae operibus sancte devovere contendunt. Quae quidem pleraeque, urgente caritate Christi, singularis civitatis vel dioecesis praetergressae angustias, adeptaeque, unius eiusdemque vi legis communisque regiminis, perfectae quamdam consociationis speciem, latius in dies proferuntur.—Duplex porro earumdem est ratio: aliae, quae Episcoporum solummodo approbationem nactae, ob eam rem *dioecesanae* appellantur, aliae vero de quibus praeterea

romani Pontificis sententia intercessit, seu quod ipsarum leges ac statuta recognoverit, seu quod insuper commendationem ipsis approbationemve impertiverit.

Iam in binas huiusmodi religiosarum Familiarum classes quaenam Episcoporum iura esse oporteat, quaeque vicissim illarum in Episcopos officia, sunt qui opinentur incertum controversumque manere.—Profecto, ad *dioecesanas* consociationes quod attinet, res non ita se dat laboriosam ad expediendum; eae quippe unâ inductae sunt atque vigent Antistitum sacrorum auctoritate. At gravior sane quaestio de ceteris oritur, quae Apostolicae Sedis comprobatione sunt auctae. Quia nimirum in dioeceses plures propagantur, eodemque ubique iure unoque utuntur regimine; ideo Episcoporum in illas auctoritatem opus est temperationem quamdam admittere certosque limites. Qui limites quatenus pertinere debeant, colligere licet ex ipsa decernendi ratione Sedi Apostolicae consueta in eiusmodi consociationibus approbandis, scilicet certam aliquam Congregationem approbari ut piam Societatem votorum simplicium, *sub regimine Moderatoris generalis, salva Ordinariorum iurisdictione, ad formam sacrorum canonum et Apostolicarum constitutionum.*—Iamvero perspicuum inde fit, tales Consociationes neque in *dioecesanis* censeri, neque Episcopis subesse posse nisi intra fines dioecesis cuiusque, incolumi tamen supremi earumdem Moderatoris administratione ac regimine. Qua igitur ratione summis societatum harum Praesidibus in Episcoporum iura et potestatem nefas est invadere; eâdem Episcopi prohibentur ne quid sibi de Praesidum ipsorum auctoritate arrogent. Secus enim si fieret, tot moderatores istis Congregationibus accederent, quot Episcopi, quorum in dioecesibus alumni earum versentur; actumque esset de administrationis unitate ac regiminis. Concordem atque unanimem Praesidum Congregationum atque Episcoporum auctoritatem esse oportet; at ideo necesse est alteros alterorum iura pernoscere atque integra custodire.

Id autem ut, omni submota controversia, plene in posterum fiat, et ut Antistitum sacrorum potestas, quam Nos, uti par est, inviolatam usquequaque volumus, nihil uspiam detrimenti capiat; ex consulto sacri Consilii Episcopis ac Religiosorum ordinibus praepositi, duo praescriptionum capita edicere visum est; alterum de Sodalitatibus quae Sedis Apostolicae commendationem vel

approbationem nondum sunt assecutae, alterum de ceteris, quarum Sedes Apostolica vel leges recognovit vel institutum commendavit aut approbavit.

Caput primum haec habet servanda:

I. Episcopi est quamlibet recens natam sodalitatem non prius in dioecesim recipere, quam leges eius constitutionesque cognorit itemque probarit; si videlicet neque fidei honestative morum, neque sacris canonibus et Pontificum decretis adversentur, et si apte statuto fini conveniant.

II. Domus nulla novarum sodalitatum iusto iure fundabitur, nisi annuente probante Episcopo. Episcopus vero fundandi veniam ne impertiat, nisi inquisitione diligenter acta quales sint qui id poscant: an recte probeque sentiant, an prudentia praediti, an studio divinae gloriae, suaeque et alienae salutis praecipue ducti.

III. Episcopi, quoad fieri possit, potius quam novam in aliquo genere sodalitatem condant vel approbent, utilius unam quamdam adsciscent de iam approbatis, quae actionis institutum profiteatur adsimile.—Nullae fere, ni forte in *Missionum* regionibus, probentur sodalitates, quae, certo proprioque fine non praestituto, quaevis universe pietatis ac beneficentiae opera, etiamsi penitus inter se disiuncta, exercenda amplectantur.

Episcopi sodalitatem condi ullam ne siverint, quae redditibus careat ad sodalium victum necessariis.—Sodalitia, quae stipe collaticia vivant; item muliebres familias, quae aegrotis, domi ipsorum, interdiu noctuque adsint, cautissime, quin etiam difficulter comprobent.—Si quae autem nova feminarum sodalitas eo spectet ut suis in aedibus valetudinaria aperiat viris promiscue mulieribusve excipiendis; vel similes domos excipiendis sacerdotibus, qui Sororum curâ atque opera aegrotantes leventur; eiusmodi propoposita Episcopi ne probent, nisi maturo adhibito severoque consilio.—Praeterea Episcopi religiosarum domus, ubi viris feminisve peregre advenientibus hospitium victusque accepto pretio suppeditetur, nequaquam permittant.

IV. Sodalitas quaevis dioecesana ad dioeceses alias ne transgrediatur, nisi consentiente utroque Episcopo, tum loci unde excedat, tum loci quo velit commigrare.

V. Sodalitatem dioecesanam si ad dioeceses alias propagari

accidat, nihil de ipsius natura et legibus mutari liceat, nisi singulorum Episcoporum consensu, quorum in dioecesibus aedes habeat.

VI. Semel approbatae sodalitates ne extinguantur, nisi gravibus de causis, et consentientibus Episcopis, quorum in ditione fuerint. Singulares tamen domos Episcopis, in sua cuique dioecesi, tollere fas est.

VII. De puellis habitum religiosum petentibus, item de iis quae, probatione expleta, emissurae sint vota, Episcopus singulatim certior fiat: eiusdem erit illas et de more explorare et, nihil si obstet, admittere.

VIII. Episcopo alumnas sodalitatum dioecesanarum professas dimittendi potestas est, votis perpetuis aeque ac temporariis remissis, uno dempto (ex auctoritate saltem propria) colendae perpetuo castitatis. Cavendum tamen ne istiusmodi remissione ius alienum laedatur; laedetur autem, si insciis moderatoribus id fiat iusteque dissentientibus.

IX. Antistitae, ex constitutionum iure, a Sororibus eligantur. Episcopus tamen, vel ipse vel delegato munere, suffragiis ferendis praeerit: peractam electionem confirmare vel rescindere integrum ipsi est pro conscientiae officio.

X. Dioecesanae cuiusvis sodalitatis domos Episcopus invisendi ius habet, itemque de virtutum studio, de disciplina, de oeconomicis rationibus cognoscendi.

XI. Sacerdotes a sacris, a confessionibus, a concionibus designare, item de sacramentorum dispensatione statuere munus Episcoporum est, pro sodalitatibus dioecesanis pariter ac pro ceteris; id quod in capite consequenti (num. VIII) explicate praefinitur.

Alterum praescriptionum caput, de Sodalitatibus, quarum Apostolica Sedes vel leges recognovit vel institutum commendavit aut approbavit, haec habet servanda:

I. Candidatos cooptare, eosdem ad sacrum habitum vel ad profitenda vota admittere, partes sunt Praesidum sodalitatum; integrâ tamen Episcopi facultate, a Synodo Tridentina tributa,[1] ut, quum de feminis agitur, eas et ante suscipiendum habitum et ante

[1] Sess. XXV, cap. XVII, de Regul. et Monial.

professionem emittendam ex officio exploret. Praesidum similiter est familias singulas ordinare, tirones ac professos dimittere, iis tamen servatis quaecumque ex instituti legibus pontificiisque decretis servari oportet.—Demandandi munera et procurationes, tum quae ad universam sodalitatem pertinent, tum quae in domibus singulis exercentur, Conventus seu *Capitula*, et Consilia propria ius habent. In muliebrium autem sodalitatum Conventibus ad munerum assignationem, Episcopus, cuius in dioecesi habentur, per se vel per alium praeerit, ut Sedis Apostolicae delegatus.

II. Condonare vota, sive ea temporaria sint sive perpetua, unius est romani Pontificis. Immutandi constitutiones, utpote quae probatae a Sede Apostolica, nemini Episcoporum ius datur. Item regimen, quod penes moderatores est sive sodalitatis universae sive familiarum singularum ad constitutionum normam, Episcopis mutare temperare ne liceat.

III. Episcoporum sunt iura, in dioecesi cuiusque sua, permittere vel prohibere novas domos sodalitatum condi; item nova ab illis templa excitari, oratoria seu publica seu semipublica aperiri, sacrum fieri in domesticis sacellis, Sacramentum augustum proponi palam venerationi fidelium. Episcoporum similiter est sollemnia et supplicationes, quae publica sint, ordinare.

IV. Domus sodalitatum huiusmodi si *clausura episcopali* utantur, Episcopis iura manent integra, quae de hac re a pontificiis legibus tribuuntur. Si quae autem *clausura*, ut inquiunt, *partiali*, utantur, Episcopi erit curare ut rite servetur, et quidquid in eam irrepat vitii cohibere.

V. Alumni alumnaeve sodalitatum harum, ad *forum internum* quod attinet, Episcopi potestati subsunt. In *foro* autem *externo*, eidem subsunt quod spectat ad censuras, reservationem casuum, votorum relaxationem quae non sint uni summo Pontifici reservata, publicarum precum indictionem, dispensationes concessionesque ceteras, quas Antistites sacrorum fidelibus suis impertire queant.

VI. Si qui vero ad sacros ordines promoveri postulent, eos Episcopus, etsi in dioecesi degentes, initiare caveat, nisi hisce conditionibus: ut a moderatoribus quisque suis proponantur; ut quae a iure sacro sancita sunt de *litteris dimissorialibus* vel *testimonialibus*, sint rite impleta; ut *titulo sacrae ordinationis* ne careant, vel

certe eo legitime eximantur; ut theologiae studiis operam dederint, secundum decretum *Auctis admodum*, die datum IV novembris anno MDCCCXCII.

VII. In sodalitates, quae mendicato vivunt, ea Episcopis stent iura, quae habet decretum *Singulare quidem* a sacro Consilio Episcopis et Religiosorum ordinibus praeposito promulgatum die XXVII martii anno MDCCCXCVI.

VIII. In iis quae ad spiritualia pertinent subduntur sodalitates Episcopis dioecesium in quibus versantur. Horum igitur erit sacerdotes ipsis et a sacris designare et a concionibus probare. Quod si sodalitates muliebres sint, designabit item Episcopus sacerdotes a confessionibus tum ordinarios tum extra ordinem, ad normam constitutionis *Pastoralis curae*, a Benedicto XIV decessore Nostro editae, ac decreti *Quemadmodum*, dati a sacro Consilio Episcopis et Religiosorum ordinibus praeposito, die XVII decembris anno MDCCCXC; quod quidem decretum ad virorum etiam consociationes pertinet, qui sacris minime initiantur.

IX. Bonorum, quibus Sodalitia singula potiuntur, administratio penes Moderatorem supremum maximamve Antistitam eorumque Consilia esse debet: singularum vero familiarum redditus a praesidibus singulis administrari oportet, pro instituti cuiusque legibus. De iis nullam Episcopus rationem potest exigere. Qui vero fundi certae domui tributi legative sint ad Dei cultum beneficentiamve eo ipso loco impendendam; horum administrationem moderator quidem domus gerat, referat tamen ad Episcopum, eique se omnino praebeat obnoxium: ita nimirum ut neque Praeposito neque Antistitae sodalitii universi liceat quidquam ex iis bonis Episcopo occultare, distrahere, vel in alienos usus convertere. Talium igitur bonorum Episcopus rationes accepti impensique, quoties videbitur, expendet; idem ne sortes minuantur, redditus ne perperam erogentur, curabit.

X. Sicubi sodalitatum aedibus instituta curanda adiecta sint, uti gynaecea, orphanotrophia, valetudinaria, scholae, asyla pueris erudiendis, Episcopali vigilantiae ea omnia subsint quod spectat ad religionis magisteria, honestatem morum, exercitationes pietatis, sacrorum administrationem, integris tamen privilegiis, quae collegiis, scholis, institutisve eiusmodi a Sede Apostolica sint tributa.

XI. In quarumlibet sodalitatum domibus vota simplicia profitentium, Episcopis cuiusque dioecesis ius est invisendi templa, sacraria, oratoria publica, sedes ad sacramentum poenitentiae, de iisque opportune statuendi iubendi.—In presbyterorum sodalitiis, de conscientia ac disciplina, item de re oeconomica uni praesides cognoscent. In consociationibus vero feminarum, aeque ac virorum qui sacerdotio abstinent, Episcopi erit inquirere num disciplina ad legum normam vigeat, num quid sana doctrina morumve probitas detrimenti ceperit, num contra clausuram peccatum, num sacramenta aequâ statâque frequentia suscipiantur.—Reprehensione dignum si quid Episcopus forte offenderit, ne decernat illico: moderatores uti prospiciant moneat; qui si neglexerint, ipse per se consulat. Si quae tamen maioris momenti occurrant quae moram non expectent, decernat statim: decretum vero ad sacrum Consilium deferat Episcopis ac Religiosorum ordinibus praepositum.

Episcopus, in visitatione potissimum, iuribus, quae supra diximus, utatur suis quod spectat ad scholas, asyla ceteraque memorata instituta. — Ad rem vero oeconomicam quod attinet muliebrium sodalitatum itemque virorum sacerdotio carentium, Episcopus ne cognoscat nisi de fundorum legatorumve administratione, quae sacris sint attributa, vel loci aut dioecesis incolis iuvandis.

His porro, quae hactenus ediximus sancivimus, nihil penitus derogari volumus de facultatibus vel privilegiis, tum Nostro aut quovis alio Sedis Apostolicae decreto concessis, tum immemorabili aut saeculari consuetudine confirmatis, tum etiam quae in alicuius Sodalitatis legibus a romano Pontifice approbatis contineantur.

Praesentes vero litteras et quaecumque in ipsis habentur nullo unquam tempore de subreptionis aut obreptionis sive intentionis Nostrae vitio aliove quovis defectu notari vel impugnari posse, sed semper validas et in suo robore fore et esse, atque ab omnibus cuiusvis gradus et praeeminentiae inviolabiliter in iudicio et extra observari debere decernimus: irritum quoque et inane declarantes si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate vel praetextu, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari; contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Volumus autem ut harum litterarum exemplis, etiam impressis, manu tamen Notarii subscriptis et per constitutum in ecclesiastica dignitate virum sigillo munitis, eadem habeatur fides, quae Nostrae voluntatis significationi his praesentibus ostensis haberetur.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo noningentesimo, sexto idus decembres, Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo tertio.

C. *Card.* Aloisi Masella, *Pro-Dat.*
A. *Card.* Macchi

visa

De Curia I. De Aquila E Vicecomitibus.

Loco ✝ *Plumbi.*

Reg. in Secret. Brevium, I. Cugnonius.

II.

Extensio Universalis Iubilaei ad Universum Catholicum Orbem.

LEO EPISCOPUS
SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

Universis Christifidelibus Praesentes Litteras Inspecturis Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Temporis quidem sacri, quod solemni caerimoniarum religione hesterno die conclusimus, sicut iucundus Nobis decursus fuit, sic est futura grata recordatio. Quod enim Ecclesia optarat, quodque spectarat unice, ut permoveret salutariter animos post annos quinque et septuaginta instaurata celebritas, id videmur, annuente Dei numine, consecuti. Non enim pauci, sed ad centena millia et ex omnibus civitatum ordinibus numerantur, qui extraordinariam sacrae indulgentiae potiundae facultatem libentes magnaque cum alacritate arripere studuerint. Neque est dubitandum, quin poenitentia salutari expiati atque ad christianas virtutes renovati plurimorum animi inde fuerint: ob eamque rem novum quoddam fidei pietatisque robur ex hoc fonte et capite catholici nominis usquequaque influxisse, non immerito existimamus.

Iamvero, quod in simili caussa Decessores Nostri consuevere, nunc est in animo Apostolicae caritatis dilatare spatia, ampliorem-que caelestium bonorum praebere facultatem. Nimirum concreditum Nobis thesaurum indulgentiae sacrae, qui anno exacto Romae tantum patuit amplissime, eumdem dimidiato anno proximo in toto orbe catholico patere universitati christifidelium volumus. Valebit id quidem, arbitramur, latius ad revocandos christianos mores, ad copulandas cum Apostolica Sede arctius voluntates, ad cetera vulgo comparanda bona, quae fuse persecuti sumus, cum primo Iubilaeum magnum indiximus. Pertinebit id ipsum ad exorientis saeculi primordia rite dedicanda: neque enim aptius videmus iniri posse saeculum, quam si homines instituant de promeritis Redemptionis Christi uberius proficere. Minime vero dubitamus, quin novum hoc salutis praesidium omnes Ecclesiae filii eo sint animo accepturi, quo est a Nobis exhibitum. Confidimus autem Venerabiles Fratres Episcopos, universumque clerum, pro explorata ipsorum vigilantia diligentiaque daturos, uti par est, operam, ut communia optata plenissime eveniant.

Itaque auctoritate omnipotentis Dei, beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli ac Nostra, Iubilaeum magnum, quod in hac Sacra Urbe celebratum est, ad universum catholicum orbem per has litteras extendimus ac sex mensium spatio prorogamus, et pro extenso prorogatoque haberi volumus.

Quapropter omnibus utriusque sexus Christifidelibus in quacumque ora ac parte terrarum exsistentibus, etiam iis qui forsan elapso anno Sacro Romam venerunt, ibique seu alibi quavis ratione hoc idem Iubilaeum a Nobis concessum adepti sunt, qui intra sex menses a die publicationis harum litterarum in qualibet Dioecesi factae computandos, Ecclesiam Cathedralem in civitate episcopali, et maiorem in ceteris locis dioecesis, tresque alias tam in illa, quam in istis, ab ipsis Ordinariis sive per se, sive per suos Officiales, aut Parochos vel Vicarios foraneos, designandas, semel saltem in die per quindecim continuos vel interpolatos dies, sive naturales, sive etiam ecclesiasticos, nimirum a primis Vesperis unius diei ad integrum subsequentis diei crepusculum devote visitaverint, et pro Ecclesiae exaltatione, haeresum extirpatione, catholicorum principum concordia, et christiani populi salute pias ad Deum preces effuderint, vere poenitentibus et confessis, sacra-

que Communione refectis, plenissimam peccatorum suorum indulgentiam, remissionem et veniam misericorditer in Domino semel concedimus et impertimus, ita tamen ut Confessio annualis et Sacra Communio Paschalis ad effectum lucrandi Iubilaei minime suffragentur. In locis vero, in quibus quatuor Ecclesiarum defectus verificetur, eisdem Ordinariis eodemque modo facultas conceditur designandi minorem Ecclesiarum numerum, seu etiam unam, si una tantum adsit Ecclesia, in quibus vel in qua fideles aliarum Ecclesiarum visitationes supplere possint, eas vel eam visitantes iteratis ac distinctis vicibus, eodem die naturali vel ecclesiastico, ita tamen ut numerus visitationum omnium sit sexaginta et per quindecim continuos vel interpolatos dies distribuantur. Ratione vero habita peculiaris conditionis, in qua certas quasdam personas versari contigerit, haec statuimus:

I. Navigantes et iter facientes, si post elapsos sex menses dictos ad sua domicilia, aut alio ad certam stationem se receperint, peractis quae praescripta sunt, et visitata quindecim vicibus Ecclesia Cathedrali, vel maiori aut Parochiali eorum domicilii vel stationis, eamdem indulgentiam consequi possint.

II. Locorum Ordinariis facultatem facimus dispensandi a praescriptis visitationibus Moniales, Oblatas, aliasque puellas ac mulieres in claustris monasteriorum aut in aliis piis domibus et Communitatibus vitam agentibus; item Anachoretas et Eremitas, aut alias quaslibet personas in carcere aut captivitate exsistentes, aut valetudine vel alio impedimento detentas, quominus statas visitationes peragant; eisque omnibus et singulis in locum visitationum alia pia opera sive per se ipsos, sive per eorum earumve Regulares Praelatos aut Confessarios, etiam extra sacramentalem Confessionem, commutandi; similiter dispensandi pueros, nondum ad primam Communionem admissos, eisque alia pia opera etiam pro sacramentali Communione praescribendi; Capitulis autem, Congregationibus tam saecularium quam regularium, Sodalitatibus, Confraternitatibus, Universitatibus, seu Collegiis quibuscumque, nec non Christifidelibus cum proprio Parocho, aut alio sacerdote ab eo deputato, statutas Ecclesias processionaliter visitantibus, easdem visitationes ad minorem numerum reducendi.

De Confessario Iubilaei haec indulgemus:

I. Moniales earumque Novitiae sibi ad hunc effectum eligere poterunt Confessarium quemcumque ad excipiendas Monialium Confessiones ab actuali Ordinario loci approbatum.

II. Ceteri omnes utriusque sexus Christifideles tam laici quam ecclesiastici, Saeculares et cuiusvis Ordinis et Instituti etiam specialiter nominandi Regulares poterunt ad eumdem effectum sibi eligere quemcumque presbyterum Confessarium, tam Saecularem, quam cuiusvis Ordinis et Instituti etiam diversi Regularem, ab Ordinario actuali loci ad audiendas personarum saecularium confessiones approbatum; vel, si agatur de Regularibus, Confessarium proprii Ordinis eligere volentibus, a Praelato Regulari ad suorum Religiosorum audiendas confessiones approbatum.

III. Confessario ita approbato et ad effectum lucrandi Iubilaei electo facultatem hac vice concedimus, intra dictum semestris spatium in foro dumtaxat conscientiae absolvendi ab excommunicationis, suspensionis et aliis ecclesiasticis sententiis et censuris a iure vel ab homine quavis de causa latis seu inflictis, etiam Ordinariis locorum, ac Nobis et Sedi Apostolicae, etiam in casibus cuicumque ac Summo Pontifici et Sedi Apostolicae speciali licet forma reservatis, et qui alias in concessione quantumvis ampla non intelligerentur concessi, necnon ab omnibus peccatis et excessibus, quantumcumque gravibus et enormibus, etiam iisdem Ordinariis ac Nobis et Sedi Apostolicae, ut praefertur, reservatis, iniuncta poenitentia salutari aliisque de iure iniungendis. Excipitur crimen absolutionis complicis, quod ter, aut amplius admissam fuerit.—Praecipue vero haereticos, qui fuerint publice dogmatizantes, ne absolvat, nisi, abiurata haeresi, scandalum, ut par est, reparaverint; item qui bona vel iura ecclesiastica acquisierint sine venia, ne absolvat nisi iis restitutis aut se composuerint, vel sincere promiserint, quam primum se composituros apud Ordinarium, vel apud Sanctam Sedem.

IV. Item vota quaecumque etiam iurata, et Sedi Apostolicae reservata (Castitatis, Religionis et obligatoriis, quae a tertio acceptata fuerint, seu in quibus agatur de damno tertii semper exceptis, necnon poenalibus, quae praeservativa a peccato nuncupantur, nisi commutatio futura iudicetur eiusmodi, ut non minus a peccato committendo refraenet, quam prior voti materia) in alia pia et salutaria opera commutare; et cum poenitentibus huius-

modi in Sacris Ordinibus constitutis etiam Regularibus super occulta irregularitate ad exercitium eorumdem Ordinum et ad superiorum assecutionem, ob censurarum violationem dumtaxat contracta, dispensare possit, dummodo ad forum ecclesiasticum non sit deducta, nec facile deducenda.

V. Similique modo cum illis qui, scienter vel ignoranter, cum impedimento gradus secundi et tertii, vel tertii solius, aut tertii et quarti, vel quarti solius consanguinitatis, vel affinitatis etiam ex copula licita provenientis, matrimonium iam contraxerunt, dummodo huiusmodi impedimentum occultum remaneat, dispensare pro foro tantum conscientiae possit ad remanendum in matrimonio.

VI. Similiter, pro foro conscientiae tantum dispensare valeat super impedimento dirimente occulto tam primi et secundi, quam primi tantum, aut secundi tantum gradus affinitatis ex copula illicita provenientis in matrimonio contracto; atque etiam, dummodo causae graves et quae canonice sufficientes habentur intersint, in contrahendo: ita tamen ut, si huiusmodi affinitas proveniat ex copula cum matre desponsatae, vel desponsandae, huius nativitas copulam antecesserit, et non aliter.

VII. Dispensare similiter, pro eodem foro, tam de contracto, quam de contrahendo possit super impedimento cognationis spiritualis, itemque super occulto impedimento criminis, neutro tamen machinante, idest quando solum concurrant adulterium et fides data de matrimonio contrahendo post coniugis mortem.

VIII. Dispensare ad petendum debitum possit in casu affinitatis incestuosae matrimonio supervenientis.

IX. Ad petendum pariter debitum cum illis qui voto simplici castitatis obstricti matrimonium contraxerunt, dispensare valeat, illos monendo facturos contra id votum, si extra usum matrimonialem delinquant, ac remansuros eodem prorsus ac antea voto obstrictos, si coniugi supervixerint.

X. Nolumus autem per praesentes litteras super aliqua alia irregularitate vel publica, vel occulta, seu defectu aut nota, aliaque incapacitate, aut inhabilitate quoquo modo contractis dispensare, vel aliquam facultatem tribuere super praemissis dispensandi, seu habilitandi, et in pristinum statum restituendi etiam in foro conscientiae; nolumus ulli Confessario facultatem tribuere absolvendi

complicem in quolibet inhonesto contra sextum Praeceptum peccato; aut complici licentiam impertiri eligendi confessarium huiusmodi ad effectum praesentium, ut iam in Constitutione Benedicti XIV, quae incipit *Sacramentum Poenitentiae* declaratum fuit: nec quidquam praefatae et aliis pontificiis Constitutionibus derogare volumus quoad obligationem denunciationum; neque demum iis, qui a Nobis et Apostolica Sede, vel ab aliquo Praelato seu Iudice ecclesiastico nominatim excommunicati, suspensi, interdicti, seu alias in sententias et Censuras incidisse declarati vel publice denunciati fuerint, nisi intra tempus dictorum sex mensium satisfecerint, et cum partibus, ubi opus fuerit, concordaverint, ullo modo has easdem Litteras suffragari posse aut debere.

Ceterum, siqui post inchoata, huius Iubilaei consequendi animo, praescripta opera, praefinitum Visitationum numerum morbo impediti complere nequiverint, Nos piae promptaeque illorum voluntati benigne favere cupientes, eosdem vere poenitentes et confessos, ac Sacra Communione refectos, praedictae Indulgentiae et remissionis participes fieri volumus. Si qui autem post obtentas absolutiones a censuris, aut votorum commutationes seu dispensationes praedictas, serium illud ac sincerum ad id alias requisitum propositum eiusdem Iubilaei lucrandi, ac cetera necessaria opera adimplendi mutaverint; licet propter id ipsum a peccati reatu immunes vix censeri possint; nihilominus huiusmodi absolutiones, commutationes et dispensationes ab ipsis cum praedicta animi dispositione obtentas, in suo vigore persistere decernimus ac declaramus.

Praesentes Litteras per omnia validas et efficaces suosque plenarios effectus, ubicumque publicatae et executioni demandatae fuerint, sortiri et obtinere, omnibusque Christifidelibus in Apostolicae Sedis gratia manentibus plenissime suffragari volumus et decernimus; non obstantibus de Indulgentiis non concedendis ad instar, et Universalibus, Provincialibus et Synodalibus Conciliis editis Constitutionibus, Ordinationibus, et generalibus seu specialibus absolutionum seu relaxationum ac dispensationum reservationibus, necnon quorumcumque etiam Mendicantium et Militarium Ordinum, Congregationum et Institutorum, etiam iuramento, confirmatione Apostolica vel quavis firmitate alia roboratis statutis, legibus, usibus, et consuetudinibus: Privilegiis quoque, Indultis et

Litteris Apostolicis eisdem concessis, praesertim in quibus caveatur expresse, quod alicuius Ordinis, Congregationis et Instituti Professores extra propriam Religionem peccata sua confiteri prohibeantur: quibus omnibus et singulis, etiamsi pro illorum sufficienti derogatione de illis eorumque totis tenoribus specialis, specifica, expressa et individua mentio facienda, vel alia exquisita forma ad id servanda foret, huiusmodi tenores pro insertis, et formas pro exactissime servatis habentes; pro hac vice et ad praemissorum effectum dumtaxat plenissime derogamus; ceterisque contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Volumus autem, ut harum Litterarum transumptis sive exemplis etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eadem ab omnibus fides habeatur, quae ipsis praesentibus haberetur, si forent exhibitae.

Nulli ergo omnino hominum licent hanc paginam Nostrae extensionis, hortationis, commissionis, concessionis, derogationis, decreti et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum eius se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum Anno Incarnationis Dominicae Millesimo noningentesimo, Octavo Calendas Ianuarii, Pontificatus Nostri Anno vicesimo tertio.

C. *Card.* ALOISI MASELLA, *Pro-Dat.*

A. *Card.* MACCI

VISA

DE CURIA I. DE AQUILA E VICECOMITIBUS.

Loco ✝ *Plumbi.*

Reg. in Secret. Brevium, I. CUGNONIUS.

Conferences.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman Documents for the month are:

APOSTOLIC LETTERS:

1. Regulating the management of religious communities which profess simple vows.
2. Extending the Jubilee Indulgence, which was proclaimed for the Eternal City last year, to the Catholic universe.

NEW REGULATIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

In the *Analecta* of this number (p. 176) we print the Latin text of an important document under the title of Apostolic Constitution regarding Institutes which make Simple Vows. The Holy See distinguishes between two classes of religious communities professing simple vows: First, those that are purely diocesan institutions, which have not received the special sanction or approbation of the Holy See; secondly, those which have received such recognition or approbation.

I.

In regard to diocesan institutes whose members make the simple vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, the following rules are laid down for their guidance:

1. It is the bishop's office before admitting to his diocese any congregation already established, to know and approve their rules, which, besides having a proper beneficent purpose, are to be conformable to the teachings of Catholic faith and morals, and to the ecclesiastical canons and decrees governing such institutions.

2. No house of any newly established congregation may be legiti-

mately opened in the diocese without the leave and approbation of the bishop, who, before granting such leave is to assure himself that those who represent the new institute are prudent persons who mainly seek God's glory and the eternal salvation of themselves and their neighbor.

3. Before establishing or approving any new institute the bishops are to ascertain whether or not there are already in the dioceses communities professing similar aims and having ecclesiastical approbation.

Institutes of religious persons who profess to do every kind of pious and charitable work, especially when they have no very definite rule of community life, are not to be encouraged, except perhaps in missions where such course is a necessity.

Institutes without an established income are not to be approved.

Institutes which are maintained by collecting alms for their support, and institutes whose members (especially women) nurse the sick in their homes and continuously (night or day), are not easily to be approved (*difficulter comprobent*). Likewise, congregations of women proposing to open sanitariums for men and women, or houses for the sick or infirm clergy, are not readily to be allowed without mature and severe deliberation.

4. Diocesan institutions of such religious are not to be admitted from one diocese to another, except with the consent of both the bishops (*loci unde* and *loci quo*).

5. Such institutions, if transplanted from one diocese to another, may not change their object and rules, except with the consent of each of the bishops in whose dioceses they have houses.

6. Institutes once approved cannot be suspended except for grave reasons and with the consent of the bishops within whose jurisdiction they have existed. But any bishop may disestablish individual houses within his own diocese.

7. Those members who desire to take the religious habit, and those who after due probation wish to make the usual (simple) vows, are to be made known to the bishop, who is to examine and admit them.

8. The bishop may by right dismiss (and dispense from the vows, except the vow of *perpetual* chastity, for which he requires a special faculty) members of the institute, whether they have made temporary or perpetual vows; but in doing so he is bound to respect the rights and authority of the superiors of the institute. Such rights would be

violated, for example, if the bishop dismissed a member without their knowledge or against their will.

9. The superiors of such institutions are to be elected by the members thereof in a constitutional manner. But the bishop presides at the elections, either in person and by delegate; and he should declare the election confirmed or void, according as conscience dictates.

10. The bishop has the right to make visitation of the houses of the institute in his diocese and to inquire into their spiritual progress, their discipline, and the accounts of their administration.

11. It belongs to the bishop to designate the priest who is to attend to the spiritual wants, the saying of Mass, administering the Sacraments, conferences, etc., for the community.

II.

To religious institutes which have the express *sanction of the Holy See*, and are thus distinguished from purely diocesan communities, the following regulations apply:

1. It belongs to the superiors of the community to admit candidates to the reception of the holy habit or to the profession of vows; the bishop has, however, the right to examine[1] the candidates before admission to the habit or to the profession of vows.

It is the office of the superiors likewise to manage the domestic affairs of each house, to dismiss postulants and professed, with only such restrictions as the rules of the institute and the ecclesiastical (Pontifical) statutes prescribe.

The chapters and councils of each institute appoint the superiors and officers both for the community at large and for the individual houses of the community. In communities of women, however, the bishop of the diocese presides either in person or by delegate at the chapter-meetings held for the election of officers.

2. Only the Sovereign Pontiff can dispense from vows (whether temporary or perpetual) made in these institutes.

No bishop is at liberty to change the constitutions of any institute approved by the Holy See. Nor can any bishop lawfully interfere with the rights of superiors to govern their institute, or the separate houses belonging to it, in the manner ordained by the constitution of the institute.

[1] Conc. Trid., sess. xxv, cap. 17.

3. It is the bishop's right to permit or to forbid the establishment of new houses or of churches, or chapels, public, semipublic, or domestic; likewise to regulate the public exposition of the Blessed Sacrament and all public devotions.

4. Communities which have the privilege of episcopal enclosure are subject to the prescribed Pontifical canons. It is the bishop's duty to see that communities enjoying partial enclosure maintain the statutes of their institute intact.

5. The persons cared for by the members of the institute (*alumni alumnaeve sodalitatum harum*) are subject to the authority of the bishop in all matters pertaining to the *forum internum;* in regard to the *forum externum* they are governed by the same laws as the rest of the faithful in the diocese.

6. If any member of a religious institute desires to be promoted to Sacred Orders, he is to be presented to the bishop by the superior of the institute; he is to obtain the requisite dismissorial or testimonial letters; he must have a *titulus sacrae ordinationis*, unless likewise legitimately exempt; he must have made a course of theology as prescribed by the decree *Auctis admodum* (November 4, 1892).

7. With regard to mendicant orders the decree *Singulare quidem* (March 27, 1896) is to be observed.

8. In spirituals the members of religious orders are subject to the bishops of the dioceses in which they labor; hence it belongs to the bishops to approve their *celebret* and their right to preach.

As regards communities of women the bishop designates the ordinary and extraordinary confessors, according to the regulations laid down in the Const. of Benedict XIV, *Pastoralis curæ*, and the decree *Quemadmodum* (December 17, 1890) which applies likewise to communities of men not taking Sacred Orders.

9. The administration of the temporal affairs of each institute belongs to the superior, the general and council. In each community the local superior is, however, to manage the domestic income according to the rules of the institute, and the bishop is not to interfere. But where there are legacies or funded reserves left to an institute for benevolent or pious purposes, there the bishop is to exact a periodical accounting and to direct that the revenues, receipts and expenses, are properly and justly managed, although such management is to be in the hands of the superior of the house.

10. All classes of institutions in care of religious communities, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, and asylums, are subject to the

vigilance and supervision of the bishop in things pertaining to their spiritual direction, doctrinal and moral observance, within the limits prescribed by the Holy See.

11. All communities making simple vows are subject to episcopal visitation, according to the canons which ordain the inspection of churches, and sanctuaries, public oratories, confessionals, etc.

In communities of priests it belongs to the superior to regulate matters of conscience, discipline, and domestic economy.

But in regard to communities of women and those of men not admitting their members to Sacred Orders, it belongs to the bishop to inquire into the observance of discipline and rule, sound doctrine and the religious life.

The bishop is not forthwith to reprehend any abuses which he may discover, but to admonish the superiors; only if these fail to correct the abuse is he to proceed to do so himself. Occasionally, however, he may deem it advisable to act at once to eliminate scandals. In such cases he is to inform the S. Congregation of Bishops and Regulars of the steps he had thought it expedient to take.

Let the bishop, especially in his canonical visitations, make use of his right regarding schools, asylums, and the like. But he is not to interfere with the economic affairs of the community, whether of women or of men not taking Sacred Orders, unless as regards funds bequeathed for the purpose of aiding local or diocesan charities or for religious purposes specially designated.

The preceding regulations are intended, however, to leave intact such special privileges as have been granted to certain religious communities under former Pontifical authority.

ARE DORMITORIES ABOVE THE CHAPEL FORBIDDEN?

Qu. The ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for January states, at page 79, that "there are no general ecclesiastical canons forbidding the construction of dormitories above chapels used for the celebration of Mass." Does not the decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, bearing date of May 11, 1641, and found in the *Decr. Auth. Prop.*, 1898, N. 756, cover the point? "An liceat clericis Seminarii habitare die noctuque et etiam dormire in domibus aedificatis super capellis . . . in quibus quotidie celebratur?". *Resp.* "Non licere, sed omnino prohibendum." A decree of the same Congregation,

September 12, 1840 (N. 2812), bears the same import. *Cf.* De Herdt, *S. Liturg. Prax.*, Vol. I, N. 177 ad 5; Ballerini-Palmieri, *Opus Theol. Mor.*, Vol. IV, Tr. X, Sect. IV, N. 311.

Resp. We repeat our statement, that "there are no general ecclesiastical canons forbidding the construction of dormitories above chapels used for the celebration of Mass." The two decisions which are quoted in behalf of such legislation, even if they had a wider application than the localities referred to, contemplate dormitories *over the sanctuary;* and the question which we answered spoke distinctly of a dormitory, "provided it does not extend over the sanctuary." The decree of May 11, 1641, speaks of rooms constructed over side chapels of the Cathedral of Cajazzo, in the Neapolitan province. These chapels are simply recesses from the right nave of the church; and, as everybody familiar with Italian churches knows, constitute sanctuaries for altars at which Mass is celebrated daily. That there should be no dormitories over these sanctuaries is in harmony with the principle of reverence becoming to the holy place, which pervades all liturgical ordinances; and for this no special legislation is required, any more than that people should not bring rocking-chairs and lounges into the church. But Rome will answer questions that imply a doubt on such subjects by insisting on reverence. The second decree referred to by our correspondent confirms our interpretation of the mind of the S. Congregation; for it distinctly says that the Ordinary, if he thinks proper, may allow the celebration of Mass in a chapel over which (*duplici concamerationе*) the soldiers have their dormitories, without any distinction as to the part where the altar is located. We are at a loss to know how any reader of approved rubricists can interpret these decisions in a narrower sense. As for De Herdt, to whom our correspondent naïvely refers, surely he is directly against such interpretation, for he restricts the implied prohibition of the S. Congregation to placing beds in which persons sleep above the altar (not above the chapel), and then very sensibly adds that Quarti (Pars III, Tit. X, N. 1) states that *there is no general law prohibiting even this*, but that it is simply unbecoming. "Censet tamen Quarti id *jure communi per se loquendo non prohiberi*, sed nihilominus non esse faciendum ob majorem decentiam et reverentiam sacrificii." Subsequently he

suggests that if necessity urge the placing of beds over the sanctuary it should be done, as far as possible, away from the immediate neighborhood of the altar. Ballerini, or rather Palmieri, who supplements this portion of the *Opus Morale*, repeats the decrees we have mentioned, indicating what is becoming in the matter.

The practice which prevails, not only in missionary countries, but in Rome or anywhere, excludes beds over the altar or sanctuary. The necessity of providing dormitories in one of the principal seminaries in the Eternal City some years ago caused the acting rector of the institution to inquire at the Sacred Office whether or not there was any objection to having these dormitories over the chapel. The answer was: "No, provided the beds are not over the sanctuary." Such is the case also in numerous religious houses throughout Italy.

Surely in matters of this kind, reverence is not minimized by refusing to torture decrees of the S. Congregations into a wider application than need be.

THE "DE PROFUNDIS" IN THE VESPER PSALMS OF CHRISTMAS.

Qu. Please state in your next issue what general rule the Church has followed in the arrangement of the different psalms for Vespers. For instance, why does the Psalm *De profundis* occur in the Second Vespers of Christmas Day? J. O.

Resp. The Vesper Office or evening service of the Church is the expression of gratitude for the graces or "lights" of the day. Now the special grace of Christmas Day is the dawn of the Redemption through the appearance of the Incarnate Word. This idea determines the choice of the psalms, the keynote of which is given in the antiphons. These antiphons are taken from the same psalms and thus give a particular meaning to the prayers in connection with the feast.

A cursory comparison of the psalms in the Christmas Vespers will readily show the perfect harmony.

1. *Antiphon.* "Tecum principium—ante luciferum genui te," expresses the eternal generation or the *Divinity* of the Holy Infant of Bethlehem. The antiphon is from the Psalm *Dixit Dominus* (109), to which it belongs.

2. *Antiphon.* "Redemptionem misit populo suo," emphasizes the *fact of the Redemption*, expressed in Psalm 110, *Confiteor*, which follows.

3. *Antiphon.* "Exortum est in tenebris lumen rectis corde," announces the *Light of the world* coming to men of good will, and is taken from Psalm 111, *Beatus vir*, the third in the order of Vespers.

4. *Antiphon.* "Apud Dominum—copiosa redemptio," expresses the *infinite merit of the Redemption.* These words are taken from the Psalm *De profundis* (129), which accordingly ensues.

5. *Antiphon.* "De fructu ventris tui ponam super sedem tuam," (*Memento*, Ps. 131), points out the fulfilment of the *prophecy* that the Redeemer would be the offspring of David, through our Blessed Mother.

In like manner the Vesper Offices of the various feasts throughout the ecclesiastical year will be found to harmonize with the sentiment of gratitude expressed in the special characteristics of the occasion, so as to offer food for the evening meditation of a thoughtful priest.

As regards the *De profundis* in particular, it is ordinarily used as a penitential prayer, because it expresses the sentiment of the inexhaustible mercy of God. With that sentiment, however, it combines an ardent longing or appeal for the benefits of that mercy, and this makes it a prayer of confident hope for the fruits of the Redemption, as applied to our own souls in the Incarnation. The same reason makes this psalm applicable at other times as a prayer for the redemption of the souls held captive in purgatory.

SACRAMENTAL CAUSALITY.[1]

(A Reply.)

By the courtesy of the editor, I am permitted to make some comment on the article entitled "Causality (Dispositive) of the Sacraments," contributed by the Rev. Charles J. Cronin, D.D., to the January number of the REVIEW. Dr. Cronin notes at the outset that Father Billot's theory of the causality of the sacraments involves two

[1] Cf. AM. ECCL. REVIEW, January, 1901, page 35.

distinct tenets; (1) that the sacraments act as instrumental dispositive causes; (2) that their agency belongs to the intentional, not the physical order. The latter of these I will deal with first. But before going further I wish to say that Dr. Cronin is more felicitous in his lucid setting forth of Father Billot's teaching than in meeting the criticism to which it was subjected in the June number of the REVIEW.

"Intentional" causality, in Father Billot's sense, is a new-fangled thing. No philosopher or theologian but himself, at least that I know of, makes it distinct from and coördinate with physical and moral causality. The division of cause into physical and moral is based on the mode of causation, and is manifestly adequate. Whatever can at all be spoken of as an efficient cause must, as was pointed out in the June number of the REVIEW,[2] act in one of two ways, either by producing or helping to produce an effect by its own virtue, or, on the other hand, by inducing in some way another cause to produce it. The note of the physical cause, be it principal or instrumental, is *productiveness:* it immediately produces or helps to produce the effect. The note of the moral cause, be it person or thing, is *persuasiveness:* it moves an intelligent physical cause to produce an effect. Whether the effect belongs to the physical order or to the psychical order matters not. That which induces an intelligent agent to produce it is a cause of the moral type, and that which itself produces it is a cause of the physical type. Dr. Cronin concedes as much when he says that "the causality of the sacraments may be called physical, if by physical is meant any cause that by *real* activity produces a *real* effect, whether its activity and effect belong to the order of nature or to the order of the intellect" (37). Why, then, maintain that the instrumentality of the sacraments belongs to the intentional not the physical order? Even supposing the effect they produce immediately to be of the intentional order, it is unphilosophical and quite misleading to speak of them as neither moral nor physical but intentional causes, for the reason that the division of cause into physical and moral rests on the manner in which the effect is produced—not on the character of the effect itself or of the activity that produces it. In short, the division of efficient cause into physical, moral, and intentional, is faulty in that it does not proceed throughout on the same basis. As well divide mankind into whites, blacks, and males; or habits into intellectual, moral, and acquired.

But even in respect of the activity itself and the effect it produces,

[2] Page 581.

Father Billot's "intentional" cause is in reality a cause of the physical type. For intentions or concepts, though viewed in one way they are entities of the logical order, yet are, when viewed in another way, real entities which may be "classed under one of the ten categories into which physical entities (of course in the wider sense of the word 'physical') are divided." As the likeness or representation of an object, a concept is a logical entity merely. As a modification of the mind, it is a real entity, a spiritual accident—not the less real for being spiritual, and not the less an entity for existing in the mind as in its subject. That, therefore, which produces this modification of the mind produces in very truth an entity of the physical (still in the wider sense of the word) as well as of the logical order, and first of the physical order, inasmuch as the representative character of the concept presupposes its being, just as the likeness of the man into which the artist moulds his statue presupposes the marble or bronze out of which it is made. Hence the spoken word is an instrument of the physical type not only in the proper sense, that is, as regards the manner of producing the effect, but also as regards the effect, which is in itself a real, spiritual entity, when viewed as a modification of the mind.[3]

Let us now turn our attention to the other tenet involved in Father Billot's theory, namely, that the sacraments are instrumental causes, not of grace itself, but of a disposition in the soul which is a right and title to grace. First of all, how does this square with the teaching of the Council of Trent, that the sacrament of Baptism is the instrumental cause of justification? The Council,[4] if we are to take its words as they stand, without qualification or limitation, affirms the sacrament to be the instrumental cause, not of a disposition or a right and title to justification, but of justification itself, and therefore of grace, which it defines to be the formal cause of justifica-

[3] In consequence of not distinguishing between the concept as an accident of the mind and the concept as the representation of an object or class of objects, Father Billot, at page 72 of his work on the sacraments, seems to misconceive the illustration employed by St. Thomas in the following passage: Nihil tamen prohibet in corpore esse virtutem spiritualem instrumentaliter, in quantum, scilicet, corpus protest moveri ab aliqua substantia spirituali ad aliquem effectum spiritualem inducendum: sicut in ipsa voce sensibili est quaedam vis spiritualis ad excitandum intellectum hominis, in quantum procedit a conceptione mentis (3a, q. 62, a. 4, ad 1.) The *virtus spiritualis* of which there is question in the objection which the Saint here deals with is, as we gather from the whole drift of the article, *ordinis physici*, not *ordinis intentionalis*.

[4] Sess. 6, cap. 6.

tion. Must we not understand its words in the meaning they bear on their face? I take it to be a sound principle of theology that the theories of theologians must be made to fit the teaching of Councils in the plain and obvious sense of the words employed to convey it—not the teaching of Councils pared down to fit the theories of theologians.

Father Billot holds that the sacrament of Baptism is the instrumental cause, not of justification, but of a disposition in the soul which is a right and title to justification. Now if this disposition were in its turn an instrumental cause of justification, the theory might still harmonize in some sort with the teaching of the Council, on the principle that *Causa causae est causa causati.* But Dr. Cronin tells us plainly "it is impossible that the disposition or title, which is the immediate effect of the active cause, should itself operate efficiently in the production of the ultimate effect."[5]

And this brings us to another point. What essential difference is there, after all, between Father Billot's theory and the old theory of the moral causality of the sacraments? Those theologians who deny that the sacraments produce grace after the manner of physical causes, say that they move God infallibly to produce it in the soul inasmuch as they are morally the actions of Christ, exhibit His merits, and are sure pledges of the grace which God is, as it were, morally bound to produce—not that He can be, strictly speaking, under a moral obligation to His creatures, but that the merits of Christ, the dignity of the sacraments, and the pledges He Himself has given, constrain Him. In this view the valid reception of the sacraments is itself a right and title to grace. What more is the disposition which the sacrament produces in the soul, in Father Billot's theory? Or what good purpose does it serve, seeing that the reception of the sacrament is itself a right and title to grace? The older theologians found the right and title to grace on the sensible sign or sacrament itself; Father Billot founds it on the disposition wrought by this sensible sign in the soul. But the causality, *so far as regards the production of grace*, is of the moral order in both cases. The difference, indeed, so far as there is a difference, is in favor of the older view, on the score of its greater simplicity.

But, says Father Billot's disciple, "It is not necessary that there should be active causality throughout the whole line of causes. It is requisite and it is sufficient that the initial cause should bring about

[5] Page 38.

the *necessity* of the ultimate effect." This we may grant, provided the necessity be of the physical order. But if it be of the moral order, then the initial cause has only a moral causality in relation to the ultimate effect. The illustration taken from the process of procreation in the human species is not to the purpose. There is no parity between the two cases. The necessity in the one case is of the physical order; in the other of the moral. Moreover, the parent is the efficient cause (secondary) of the *son* it is true, but not of the son's *soul*, which is what corresponds to grace in the other case. Reasoning *a pari*, therefore, we should come to the very opposite conclusion, to wit, that as the virtue in the semen, though it disposes the matter by a final disposition which necessitates the form, is not the instrumental cause of the soul; so neither would the sacrament, though it should dispose the soul by a final disposition necessitating the form, be the instrumental cause of grace. The reasoning, indeed, is *a fortiori*, the disposition in the case of the sacrament creating but a moral necessity for the production of the form. And yet the sacrament is the instrumental cause of justification, in the strict and proper sense—else are the words of the Council inaccurate and misleading.[6]

[6] At page 113 of his work, Father Billot seeks to turn aside the edge of this argument. He points out that the soul, being a spiritual substance, has an existence of its own (intrinsically) independent of the body; while grace, being an accident, has no independent existence, but exists in the soul. "Now," he argues, "the being of an accident is its in-being (*esse accidentis est inesse*), according to the oft-quoted saying; and, therefore, that which is the cause of grace being in (the soul), is also the cause of its being. Hence, the sacraments may well be the instrumental cause of grace, so far as an accident can be said to be produced and to have a cause." The drift of Father Billot's reasoning here I take to be this: As the semen is the instrumental cause of the soul being in the body, so the sacrament is the instrumental cause of grace being in the soul; but the being of grace is its in-being; therefore, the sacrament may well be the instrumental cause of grace. This reasoning, if valid, would prove too much—for Father Billot. It would prove that the sacrament is an instrumental cause of grace, and not merely of a disposition which is a right and title to it. But it is not valid. For, as the semen is the instrumental cause only of the fact that the soul is in the body, not of the entity of the soul; so the sacrament, in Father Billot's theory, would be the instrumental cause only of the fact that grace is in the soul, not of the entity of grace. Now the fact of its being in the soul is not the entity of grace, else the accidents could not even by a miracle remain in the Eucharist, seeing that the fact is that they are not in a subject. It must be borne in mind that grace, though but an accident, is still a real entity of the physical order. Produced, then, it needs must be by a cause of the physical order, though after the manner proper to an accident, namely, not independently of a subject, but dependently on a subject. And if God, who produces it as principal agent, uses the sacrament as His instrument only in producing a disposition in the soul which is a right and title to grace, it would be a wresting of words from their natural and obvious meaning to speak of the sacrament as the instrumental cause of grace.

One quite fails to see what intrinsic difference there is between the way in which, according to Father Billot's view, Baptism confers grace, and the way circumcision conferred it on the Israelitish child. The right and title to grace founded on the mark in the flesh was just as valid, and just as infallibly carried grace with it, as the right and title founded on the mark in the soul. *How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements?*

As regards the mind of St. Thomas, I would say that it is not to be gathered from his *obiter dicta*, but from the words he uses where he treats of the question *ex professo*. This he does in his commentaries on the Book of the Sentences, in the *Quaest Disp. de Veritate*, and in the *Summa Theologica*. In the first of these, following the lead of the Master whose text he is commenting, he puts forward, as far as regards dispositive causality, the view now upheld by Father Billot. But neither here nor elsewhere does he teach that the sacraments are "intentional" causes, in Father Billot's sense. The passage that was quoted from the Fourth Book of the Sentences, in the June REVIEW (p. 581), is by itself decisive of this point; and I am not a little surprised that Dr. Cronin should have so completely ignored it. Of course St. Thomas often "by 'intention' clearly means concept." But he certainly does not mean concept, or anything "belonging to the order of concepts or cognition," when he uses the adjective formed from that word to describe the virtue that belongs to an instrument in so far as it is moved by a principal agent. He means precisely what he says, a virtue "fluens et incompleta *in esse naturae*."[7]

In the other two works written when he had reached the maturity of his powers, not by way of comment on the text of another, but to set forth his own teaching, the Saint affirmed, in clear and categoric form, that the sacraments are instrumental causes of grace itself.

As this paper has already run to considerable length, I will ask the Editor's leave to deal with the question more fully in another issue of the REVIEW. In the meantime, I will just quote and place side by side a passage from each of the three works mentioned above, and let the reader decide for himself whether St. Thomas did not really outgrow the view of sacramental causality which he adopted from others in his earlier years. The title in each case is: *Utrum Sacramenta novae legis sint causa gratiae:*

"Now there belongs to these material instruments an operation which is natural to them, as cleansing, in the case of water, and giv-

[7] 3a, q. 62, a. 3.

ing the body a glossy appearance, in the case of oil. But beyond this, as instruments of God's mercy unto justification, they produce an effect in the soul itself, an effect that is their primary and proper one, such as the character, or something of the kind. But of the ultimate effect, which is grace, they are not the instrumental causes, except dispositively, inasmuch as that of which they are the efficient instrumental causes is a disposition which necessitates, so far as lies with it, the receiving of grace.[8] Dist. I, q. I, I.

"The sacraments of the New Law are not principal causes of grace, producing it of themselves, but instrumental causes. Like other instruments they have a twofold operation. One, which exceeds their natural virtue, they have from the virtue proper to the principal agent, to wit, God; and this is justification. Another they perform by their own natural virtue, as in cleansing, or anointing.[9] Quaest. Disp. De Gratia, a.4, ad 2.

"An instrument has a twofold operation. One operation it has precisely as an instrument; and this it performs, not by its own virtue, but by the virtue of the principal agent. Another operation it has of its own, which belongs to it by reason of its nature and make. Thus, an axe is apt to cut by reason of its sharpness, but apt to make a bed as the instrument of the joiner. But it does not perform its operation as an instrument save by performing its own operation; for it is by cutting it makes the bed. In like manner, material sacraments, by the operation proper to themselves, which they perform on the body, produce an effect on the soul as instruments in the hands of God. So the water of Baptism, while it washes the body, by its own virtue, cleanses the soul as the instrument of the Divine power; for soul and body are one being."[10] 3 q.62, a. 1, ad 2.

ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.

St. Francis Xavier's College, Antigonish, N. S.

[8] Hujusmodi autem materialibus instrumentis competit aliqua actio ex natura propria, sicut aquae abluere, et oleo facere nitidum corpus; sed ulterius in quantum sunt instrumenta divinae misericordiae justificantis, pertigunt ad aliquem effectum in ipsa anima, quod primo correspondet sacramentis, sicut est character, vel aliquid hujusmodi. Ad ultimum autem effectum, quod est gratia, non pertingunt etiam instrumentaliter, nisi dispositive, in quantum hoc ad quod instrumentaliter effective pertingunt est dispositio quae est necessitas, quantum in se est, ad gratiae susceptionem.

[9] Sacramenta novae legis non sunt causa gratiae principalis, quasi per se agentia, sed causa instrumentalis; et secundum modum aliorum instrumentorum habent duplicem actionem; unam quae excedit formam propriam, sed est ex virtute formae principalis agentis, scilicet Dei, quae est justificare; et aliam quam exercent secundum formam propriam, sicut abluere, vel ungere.

[10] Instrumentum habet duas actiones. Unam instrumentalem secundum quam operatur non virtute propria, sed in virtute principalis agentis. Aliam autem habet actionem propriam, quae competit sibi secundum propriam formam; sicut securi competit scindere ratione suae acuitatis, facere autem lectum in quantum est instrumentum artis: non autem perficit instrumentalem actionem nisi exercendo actionem propriam; scindendo, enim, facit lectum. Et similiter sacramenta corporalia, per propriam operationem quam exercent circa corpus, quod tangunt, efficiunt operationem instrumentalem ex virtute divina circa animam; sicut aqua baptismi, abluendo corpus secundum propriam virtutem; abluit animam in quantum est instrumentum virtutis divinae; nam ex anima et corpore unum fit.

PROVISION FOR INFIRM CLERGYMEN IN MEDIÆVAL ENGLAND.

(Communicated.)

Apropos of the recent discussions relating to the support of clergymen who have become unfit for duty by causes such as sickness or old age, it may not be amiss to note how the question was one that occupied the attention of our mediæval predecessors no less than ourselves. It would seem that they solved the problem which the question involved more readily, if not with better results, than we have done.

In many cases it was easy enough of solution, particularly when the income of a benefice was sufficiently large to obtain the aid of an assistant. But it should be borne in mind that most ecclesiastical holdings in the care of the diocesan priests were of small value compared with the revenues of an ordinary city parish of to-day in the United States. The common impression is to the opposite. Yet it is erroneous, at least so far as we know. Mediæval figures, above all when applied to finance, are rarely trustworthy; yet we can form some idea of the wealth of the parochial clergy from official documents. The best is the famous "Taxatio" of Pope Nicholas IV in 1291–1292, when a survey of the income of all benefices was taken up by the royal officers in order to collect the tenths accorded Edward I by Pope Nicholas for the Crusade. The fact of this survey showing the existence of no less than 8,542 endowed places of public worship and centres of pastoral care, is of itself sufficient to prove that the wealth of the Church was pretty evenly and widely distributed, all the more so when we take into account that the total population of England was then between two and three millions all told. Again, the value of each individual benefice was further decreased by the amounts either in cash or kind appropriated by their patrons, and by religious orders. The richest living in Canterbury, for instance, had a revenue not exceeding £133 (equal in purchasing value to about $15,000 or $16,000 in our money), a small revenue indeed compared to the enormous incomes of our Philadelphia, New York and Boston parishes. We wonder, indeed, how the clergy lived at all. The problem, however, is soluble in view of the fact that the parish pastors (rectors) were generally of the well-to-do class, and were able out of their own estate to make up for any deficiencies in the parish receipts, and finally that the cost of living was then much smaller than at present, some going so far as to maintain that money had then twenty-

four times the purchasing power it possesses to-day. Hence a country rector (and they were then as well off as those of the city) could at least live on the apparently ridiculous income of five pounds, (equal now to about $600); the state of the assistant or chaplain in proportion.

Therefore, cases must have been rare when a rector could out of his income employ an assistant when old age or ill health rendered himself unfit for work. What then was to be done? The ordinary procedure seems to have been for the bishop to sequestrate the benefice and appoint a neighboring clergyman as sequestrator.

The old rector was given a certain amount of the parish revenues for support and allowed to remain in the parsonage, there to spend the remainder of his days at least free of the danger and disgrace of beggary. He was not, however, a *pastor emeritus* as we understand that term, because the chaplain appointed in his stead had complete and independent control of affairs, so far as in those days of patronage a parish priest could have. This chaplain was, therefore, not an intruder or guest; he was rather the host of the former pastor. The latter, of course, did not always consent willingly to such arrangements, especially when the living assigned him was small. Thus we read of a certain priest of whom complaint was made in 1322 that he had not resided in his parish for ten years as a result of old age and ill health; that in consequence both the spiritual and financial interests of the parish had badly suffered. Needless to say that the aforesaid would have objected to being pensioned off, provided he received, as we read of in another case, only two shillings a week for maintenance. True, the retiring pastor had sometimes just cause to doubt the generosity and even justice of the new incumbent, if we can judge by the example of one John Mon who, by reason of old age, was compelled to resign in favor of an assistant; because a second admonition from the bishop seems to have been necessary to compel the said assistant to support the poor old priest properly, "lest in process of time to the scandal of the clergy, the said John should be compelled miserably to beg." A curious complication of the intrinsic difficulties of this question was added by the prevalence of leprosy in those times. The parish priest in the performance of his duties frequently fell a victim to that dreaded disease. As the public made little or no provision for the care of such unfortunates, the priest so afflicted became a charge upon the parish. In that case, he was still allowed to remain in the parsonage, supported by the new

rector, but was isolated in order to avoid contagion. Thus, in 1330, a certain priest of the diocese of Exeter fell a prey to this disease. He was assigned "the better chamber with the houses adjoining it, except the hall, to live, eat and drink in; the entrance should be closed between the said chamber and hall and a new entrance made to the said chamber externally in a suitable place, by which the vicar (the new incumbent) could have ingress and egress when needed." Surely this is more merciful treatment than would be accorded an unfortunate priest of to-day who might fall victim to a less dangerous disease in the performance of his duty.

All this holds for clergymen already in possession of a benefice. But what of the unbeneficed, or, as we would now say, of the assistants, chaplains, *et id omne genus?* The author[1] from whom we quote informs us with unmeant sarcasm that "we meet with a few examples of kindly care of them." For example: in 1237 the Bishop of Durham obtained the papal license to place certain clerks of his diocese who had become old and weak and blind, in a house together, and assign the titles of his wills for their support. Thomas Ricard, in 1433, leaves "to John Wright, chaplain, because he is blind and poor, a mark (13*s.* 4*d.*) per annum for life." This is the only instance we have met where the indigent clerics were assigned a common dwelling. We have yet to meet a case where they were committed to the doubtful mercy of an insane asylum, not to mention a house of refuge or a Keely institute parading under the name of a hospital.

In reading these accounts, what stands out most prominently is the fact that the case of infirm priests was not left to the priests themselves, but was regarded as a public duty incumbent upon the bishop and the parish. True, there were the so-called Gilds of the Kalendars, composed of priests, and all other gilds of the day, of a more or less charitable nature. But they were a mere drop in the bucket; their allowances at most were more in the nature of a temporary assessment to aid in tiding over a spell of sickness, something like the assessments of the Catholic Benevolent Legion. Primarily they were more in the nature of alumni associations, so to speak, that is, convivial meetings, where also, and naturally, questions of all sorts touching upon the good of the local clergy were discussed, as, for instance, at our conferences. For permanent support, however, they provided

[1] "Parish Priests and Their People in the Middle Ages in England," by the Rev. Edward L. Cutts (1898, S. P. C. K.), *passim.*

but little. The prevailing idea, therefore, upon the subject of the support of indigent clergy was that it was a solemn duty strictly incumbent upon the bishop and the parish. In the eyes of mediæval Englishmen, the priest was in justice entitled to a support befitting his dignity whensoever he became too infirm for further work. He was not to be regarded as a charge, a burden, as a useless branch, a stumbling-block, an inconvenient and undesirable somebody who was expected to relieve his old friends of their embarrassment by quietly resigning and then burying himself in some quieter sylvan retreat to read Mass for gentlemen of very dubious mental and moral character; a shadow to be avoided on the street, a ghost at festive meetings; one over whose long-hoped-for demise the charitable breathe a sigh of relief. No! he was in their eyes a soldier with the scars of battles fought and won in the service of his Divine Leader; worthy, therefore, of an honorable support, and, even though stricken with leprosy, still allowed at least to watch from his window his flock passing back and forth upon their daily occupations, and hear them chanting in the church the old hymns of his own boyhood.

We can discuss *ad unguem* the legal technicalities involved in the question of such support, but we will forever remain far from its solution until we go back to the good old mediæval principle that the infirm parochial clergy have a *right* to *honorable* support; that the same is not a mercy.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

Notre Dame College, Baltimore, Md.

DISINTERMENT REQUIRES LICENSE FROM THE ORDINARY.

Qu. Will you please give me the particular authority for the statement in your *Liturgical Breviary* (August, 1900, p. 183, n. 6), which reads as follows: "No one may be disinterred without permission from the Ordinary." I have a case just in hand and should like the canon, etc., on the subjct. EPISCOPUS.

Resp. The authority is the *Roman Ritual* (Tit. VI, cap. I, n. 15), "De exequiis:" "Nullum porro cadaver perpetuae sepulturae traditum, ex ulla cujusvis Ordinis ecclesia asportari liceat nisi de licentia Ordinarii." The expression "ulla ecclesia" here used is universally understood by liturgists and canonists to mean the burial-place of the Church, whether that be in the church edifice

or the graveyard belonging to it by special consecration. Thus Barruffaldi in his commentary on the *Roman Ritual* says authoritatively: "Immediate ac cadaver aliquod sepulturae ecclesiasticae traditum est, jurisdictioni Ordinarii subjacet: ideoque sine ejus licentia non potest exhumari et asportari." (*Ad Rit. Rom. Comment.*, Tit. XXXIV, n. 128.) This gives at once the meaning of and the reason for the common law which is recognized, as we said, by all canonists.

COULD A PROTESTANT BE ADMITTED TO SERVE MASS?

Qu. Not long ago, whilst serving in a hospital, I came upon a young man who had been in the South African War, and who was suffering from the effects of exposure and ill-treatment. He called for me and said he was a convert. When, after some time, I asked him how he had become a Catholic, he told me a strange story. It appears that as a little lad he had taken a fancy to the church in his native town, and liked to go there in the morning when he saw other people on their way to Mass. The priest noticed him and asked him one day whether he would like to learn to serve Mass. The boy was willing, and soon knew so well how to serve at the altar that the priest let him come whenever he liked. After some years had thus passed the lad said he wanted to be a Catholic. When his parents and brothers heard of the matter they became greatly excited and so tormented the youth that he finally fled from home and enlisted in the foreign army. But, said he, "although since that time I have had many hardships to undergo, I am very happy."

Now what I would like the REVIEW to tell me is whether or not a Protestant boy—I mean a good lad—could be admitted to serve Mass.

EL REIXET.

Resp. No; a Protestant boy should not be admitted to serve Mass, because of implied irreverence arising out of such *communicatio in sacris.*

But the boy in the above story was not a *Protestant* boy, unless the name he inherited from his parents could make him so. He was a Catholic boy long before he made his enunciation of the Creed admitting him to the external body of the Church. His essential profession of faith was his desire to serve at the altar, so

long as that desire was not a mere flippant act of curiosity. Such cases are rare, but when they occur God points to a soul that thus instinctively seeks Him as marked with the seal of His own election, which needs only opening of the channels of grace to communicate higher life in and through the Church. However, in deciding the qualifications of a boy for serving at the altar, many things should be taken into consideration, in order to avoid scandalizing the weak.

POLITICAL FEDERATION OF CATHOLICS.

The Rev. J. B. Delaney, editor of *The Guidon*, a Catholic magazine, published in Manchester, N. H., writes to us:

"With reference to the proposed Federation of Catholic Societies I venture to submit to the consideration of your clerical readers the following view already expressed by me in an editorial of our own diocesan magazine. The views may appear somewhat more radical than those commonly held; but I offer them in all seriousness, and they appear to me worthy of consideration by those who really believe that anything can be accomplished by Federation, to remedy the evils of which we complain."

The writer expresses his disappointment at the result of the attempted federation of Catholic societies in New York last November, and makes the following comment:

"Greatest stress was laid upon the fact that this federation must not be considered at all political; that it was intended for 'mutual encouragement,' 'the better understanding of each other,' or some such banal generalities which mean nothing, when brought down to their last resolve. What is the use of wasting our time and breath and mileage to such little purpose? If we have political grievances let us seek political redress. If we believe that we have been unfairly dealt with, that, as Catholics, we have been discriminated against as in the Indian question, that we have not received due consideration in the commissions dealing with our new possessions, and that we have been pushed aside in army and navy preferment, then why do we not say so? Or, rather, why do we stop at saying so? These are political grievances pure and simple, and their remedy can be only political. In theory, of course, we all stand free and equal before the law, but in reality it is only those who can back up their demands with political weight that will have their claims allowed. Those in charge of the political machine, to whatever party they belong, are not in the governing business for the sake of their health, nor from purely patriotic motives. They are bound by a thousand party ties and are influenced by motives of expediency, and though they may prate about right,

justice, and equality, it is only when either party will see that it is bad politics to refuse us our demands that those demands will be acceded to.

"The great danger the federationists fear is the formation of a 'Catholic Party,' or our identification with one or other of the great parties, and the use of religion as a political lever with the consequent stirring of sectional strife. The good judgment of those concerned and the lessons of history should be a sufficient guarantee that such a danger is very remote. A judicious use of the balance of power is all that is needed. Catholics in England have managed such affairs without any distinctive Catholic party and have had their just claims allowed, not because they were just, but because politicians found it to their own advantage. When the bishops of England in the last elections called upon their people to demand of the candidates how they would vote on the 'voluntary school' question and a Catholic university for Ireland, instructing them at the same time to oppose any candidate adverse to these measures, not a single paper in England accused the prelates of exceeding their rights as citizens or of exercising undue influence over the people of their charge. Had our American bishops in the late election done as much they, perhaps, would not have escaped a sound berating from those they opposed, but the good sense of the people at large would, in the end, justify their course. All that is needed is an unbroken loyalty on the part of the laity, a wise direction from proved leaders, and a little more courage to stand up for the right and insist on getting it."

SCRIBNERS' EDITION OF THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS.

Qu. Would you kindly state whether the English versions of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, such as the one published by Charles Scribner's Sons, in ten volumes, are reliable? I am a priest who has only a limited amount of money to invest in the formation of a serviceable library, and would not care to spend it on books which are unreliable.

Resp. Apart from earlier fragmentary editions of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, such as Whiston's *Apostolic Writings* (London, 1711), the first systematic attempt to publish an English version of the Patristic books was made in 1837, at Oxford, under the active direction of Pusey, Keble, and Newman. The translators issued forty-eight volumes, including the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. The edition was an excellent and faithful rendering of the original texts.

The next edition of early Patristic writings, done into English under the title of *Library of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, was arranged

in 1873, by Professors Roberts and Donaldson. It was issued in Edinburgh, by T. and T. Clark, and adheres to the originals. A reprint of this edition was undertaken by the Christian Literature Company, of Buffalo, later of New York, which secured the services of the Protestant Bishop Cleveland Coxe, who deemed it his duty to distort the sense and purpose of the text by the addition of prefatory notices and footnotes, and to indulge in sectarian bigotry by endeavoring to explain away the evidence of Catholic doctrine taught by the Fathers. It is this edition that is being sold by Charles Scribner's Sons, who have apparently had an interest in the Christian Literature scheme.

To demonstrate the utter unreliableness of Bishop Coxe's annotated edition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers we take, without any attempt at selecting, the first passage that occurs to us on opening one of the volumes. In the famous plea of Athenagoras, the Athenian, in behalf of the Christians (Chap. XXXV), it is stated that their religion condemned the pagan practice of abortion as murder. To this statement Dr. Coxe makes the following note: "Let Americans read this, and ask whether a relapse into heathenism is not threatening our civilization. May I venture to refer to 'Moral Reforms,' a little book of my own, rebuking this iniquity and *tracing the earliest violation of this law of Christian morals, and of nature itself, to an unhappy Bishop of Rome*, rebuked by Hippolytus."[1]

Now, in the first place, it is to be noted that Hippolytus, whom Dr. Coxe cites as his authority for vilifying a Roman Pontiff, St. Callistus, as teaching the crime of abortion, was a schismatic anti-Pope. According to the latest researches, by De Rossi, he had embraced the Novatian heresy, was condemned to death by Valerian, and on his way to execution retracted his errors and died an edifying death; whence he is commonly regarded as a Christian martyr and styled St. Hippolytus. In his works, especially the *Philosophumena*, which are in many respects valuable, though in great part mutilated or lost, he attacks with the bitterness of a rival and would-be reformer the saintly Roman Bishops for tolerating certain abuses. One of the charges he makes against St. Callistus,

[1] Vol. II, p. 147, Christian Literature edition. *Cf.* also Vol. VI, p. 345, Edinburgh Series of Ante-Nicene Fathers.

following the footsteps of his predecessor, Pope Zephyrinus, is, that he had relaxed the discipline against criminals who had formerly been excluded from the communion of the Church by the severe penitential canons of the time. Among these criminals were such as had committed murder, abortion, and open idolatry. These, provided they had done public penance, the Pontiff wished to be readmitted to the Church. Hippolytus held such acts to be unpardonable and charges the Pontiff with criminal connivance, saying that he was ready to condone every kind of crime—*πᾶσιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ αφίεσθαι ἁμαρτίας* (*Philosoph.*, IX, 12).

By the vile reasoning process of Dr. Coxe this means that the Pontiff sanctions murder and abortion. Our Lord's action in the case of Magdalen must have a sad meaning for such critics if in their malice they can be consistent.

It is needless to add that the notes of Dr. Coxe abound in similar falsehoods and vile insinuations, and that no open-minded and honest student, Catholic or non-Catholic, of the Fathers, can profit by such interpretations of the Patristic books.

THE DISPENSATION IN MIXED MARRIAGES POST FACTUM.

Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Reverend Dear Sir:—I desire to quote in behalf of sound doctrine a part—the principal part—of a letter received last night from Rome. It bears on the question raised some time ago about reconciling valid, but unlawful, mixed marriages.

"*Roma, 12 Dicembre 1900.*

"*Prot. 41349.*

"Illme ac Rme Dne.

"Recepi litteras quibus Amplitudo Tua alia dubia proposuit circa mixta matrimonia.

"Quaeritur in primis utrum in istis matrimoniis conjuges antequam dispensationem recipiant, uti possint matrimonio. Ut bene novit Amplitudo Tua hujusmodi mixta matrimonia, idest inter baptizatos inita quorum una pars catholica est, alia acatholica, sunt quidem valida nisi aliquod impedimentum dirimens habeatur, sed sunt illicita, unde quousque per dispensationem ecclesiasticam legitima evaserint, usus matrimonii est omnino illicitus.

[*Signed.*] "M. *Card.* LEDOCHOWSKI.

"ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secrius.*"

You can judge from the above whether the parties can dispense themselves or not; whether or not an impediment impedes until removed by competent authority; whether "prohibitum prohibet," or not, in this case at least.

Wishing the compliments of the season,

ORDINARIUS.

Resp. That the *usus matrimonii* of parties who have married despite the injunction of the Church, and without being reconciled, should be deemed unlawful, is a logical inference from the fact that the act being done in contumacy is sinful, and therefore unlawful, until atoned for in the Sacrament of Penance. But we would respectfully repeat that the marriage, which is recognized by the Church as valid, should need a *dispensation* from the bishop after it has been consummated, appears a mere theoretical speculation which theologians, as we have already pointed out, generally discredit in practice. To insist upon such a construction may make the parties conscious that a bishop has rights and privileges which they have disregarded, but beyond this it can only lead to misunderstanding the value of that authority in practice. Cardinal Ledochowski, of course, is perfectly right, and could not have answered anything else to the question proposed. But he would hardly insist that the delinquents, after having made a confession, should go to the Ordinary and ask a dispensation for entering a contract which is already made and which was recognized as valid before the Church from the moment it was made, whatever wrong the parties did in not seeking in advance the explicit permission of the authorities for the act. Where the Ordinary reserves the case expressly, for reasons best known to himself, recourse must be had to him, not for the dispensation, but for a just penalty, because his authority had been set aside by the contumacious marriage. For this view we cited Lehmkuhl and Putzer,[1] and we still maintain it as most reasonable.

[1] *Cf.* September REVIEW, p. 299.

WHAT OF "LUKE DELMEGE"?

Qu. What has become of Luke Delmege? Are we to have no more of him? Perhaps the Editor believes with some whom I have heard express an opinion on the subject, that the story is not as interesting as *My New Curate*, at least to the readers of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. I am of quite a different opinion, and consider *Luke Delmege* a better piece of literary work, both in point of character-painting and finish of language, than the first serial that appeared in the REVIEW. There must be many others of the same mind as I, for whose sake I would ask you to give us more of the story—as much as you have room for, or Father Sheehan can produce.

Resp. The Reverend Luke Delmege is on the Irish Channel, on his way across to his native heath. He will appear again in these pages next month, all the brighter for the brief rest he has had since leaving his English mission. The *Idiota* period, with its hard lessons, is passing away and amid the old home influences we shall see Luke grow more into the likeness of "Father Dan," whom everybody loves as the typical parish priest of former days. We can promise our readers a genuine treat, in order to serve which we shall have to add some sixteen pages to the regular issue of the REVIEW, as our space is otherwise insufficient for a connected portion, each month, of Father Sheehan's charming story.

PRAYERS AFTER MASS.

Qu. There is a custom here of saying certain prayers for the sick, the deceased, or for special needs of the faithful, immediately after the daily Mass, the priest remaining vested at the altar during the recitation. Is this in conformity with the rubrics?

When the celebrant himself recites these prayers are they to be said before or after the prayers enjoined by the Holy Father at the end of Mass?

Does the celebrant hold the chalice whilst reciting them, or may he leave it on the altar until they are finished?

Resp. The above-mentioned custom is entirely proper, if it has the (at least, tacit) approval of the Ordinary—"dummodo preces dicantur assentiente Ordinario" (S. C. R., August 31, 1867).

The prayers are to be recited after the prayer enjoined by the Sovereign Pontiff, and, as these are to be said "junctis manibus," the chalice should be left on the altar in the meantime.

Recent Bible Study.

ACCORDING to the popular theory, the Old Testament is not thought proper to be placed in the hands of children, and this conviction has formed the basis of the Protestant Sunday-school methods for several decades. Now, Dr. G. Stanley Hall, President of Clark University, and one of the leading American psychologists, has investigated the religious ideas of fourteen thousand children, and has noticed a general preference for Old Testament characters. The stories of Daniel, of David and Goliath, and of Samuel, appear to be the favorites among children. According to Dr. Hall, it is especially the age of childhood that is impressed with the justice, obedience, law, and habits of the Old Testament, while the love taught in the New Testament finds a fitting place in the period of adolescence, when the sentiment of love awakens. In the later years of adolescence there is an attraction to the spirit of utter devotion as manifested by Jesus, and this seems to be the time for inculcating piety, charity, and other unselfish tendencies. Dr. Hall is of opinion that "Catholics, especially in France, have reconstructed the religious training of youth, and that Jews have made a greater advance in this respect than the so-called orthodox or the Unitarians."

We print the following few lines not on account of the intrinsic merit of their contents, but in order to illustrate the vagaries of our present-day theosophists. *The Universal Brotherhood Path*[1] contains a contribution of Mr. M. L. Guild, an American theosophist, explaining, as it were, the relation of his peculiar tenets to the results of Biblical Criticism. He grants that the literal sense of Sacred Scripture overflows with errors in history, ethnology, and physical science, but he contends that the inner sense of the Bible fully agrees with the results of modern investigation. The creation-days in Genesis are explained as a succession of divine manifestations and nonmanifestations; the order of creation—fire, air or gases, water, land, vegetation, atmosphere, creeping

[1] Point Loma, Cal., October.

things, fishes, birds, land animals and true mammals, man—perfectly harmonizes with the succession of scientific evolution. The fall in the garden of Eden is a lapse from the infant-state of irresponsible existence and unconscious bliss into a state of mental activity and moral responsibility, the return from which is prevented by the flaming power of will and consciousness. Writings like those of Mr. Guild are tangible arguments for the absolute need of establishing the true literal sense of Sacred Scripture before attempting to investigate its so-called inner meaning.

Our readers will be glad to learn that the first part of the promised Supplement to Hatch and Redpath's Concordance[2] has made its appearance, and contains the Concordance of Proper Names in the Septuagint; various small supplementary matters and an Index to the Hebrew of the whole work have thus been left for the second part of the Supplement, which will be published probably during the course of the present year. The first part is a marvel of accuracy, and must have cost its author a stupendous amount of labor and worry. The difficult question of the pronunciation of Hebrew about two hundred years before Christ forms but one of the minor queries.

The student of Apocryphal literature and of early Christianity will be helped considerably by the critical edition of *The Ascension of Isaiah*, published by Prof. R. H. Charles.[3] The Ethiopic translation of the work was well known from the edition and translation published by the late Prof. Dillmann in 1877 from two MSS. in the British Museum and a third in the Bodleian Library. Prof. Charles has used for his edition not merely the Ethiopic version, but also the newly discovered Greek fragment, the late Greek recension published by Dr. O. von Gebhardt in 1878 from a Paris MS., the two Latin versions published respectively by Antonius de Fantis in 1522 and by Cardinal Mai in 1828, and a translation of the Slavonic version made by Prof. Bonwetsch. These versions are conveniently printed in parallel

[2] A Concordance to the Septuagint, by E. Hatch, D.D., and H. A. Redpath, M.A.; Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. Supplement, fasc. 1; fol. pp. 162; 16*s*.

[3] The Ascension of Isaiah, translated from the Ethiopic version, which, with new Greek fragment, Latin versions, Latin translation of Slavonic, is here published in full. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Indexes, by R. H. Charles. 8vo, pp. 232. 1900. 7*s*. 6*d*. A. and C. Black.

columns, and a careful translation with learned notes has been added. In the Introduction the author traces the history of the different versions, and describes their relation to one another and to the Greek text. In his analysis of the structure of the Ascension Prof. Charles follows Ewald and Dollman in recognizing three independent writings as the basis of the apocryphal work. Besides all this, Dr. Charles has added an essay on Antichrist, because the Christian portion of the Ascension contains much concerning his appearing.

Our readers have heard, no doubt, of the many Greek papyri found in Egypt, and of the many valuable fragments of classical and theological works that have been restored by their means. The publication of these papyri has hitherto been carried on under the auspices of museums and scientific societies; but the latest addition to these materials is due to the private enterprise of Lord Amherst of Hackney, assisted by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt. It has been entrusted to these latter two scholars to describe the Amherst papyri which now form probably the most important private collection in existence. The first volume contains mainly theological works, among which the most important are the Ascension of Isaiah and a Christian hymn, both of which were obtained by Lord Amherst last year. It has been seen in the preceding paragraph that, though the whole or the greatest part of the Ascension of Isaiah had been written in Greek, the work in its entirety exists only in Ethiopic. The Greek Paris MS. exhibits a very late recension found in a twelfth century lectionary, and is therefore of little value for constructing either the history or the original text of the Ascension; but the fragment of the work in Lord Amherst's possession dates from about the fifth or sixth century, and furnishes a portion of the Greek text which is of great value for comparison with the Ethiopic and other versions. Besides the Ascension and an early Christian hymn, the first volume contains also a mutilated letter written from Rome, and some Biblical and liturgical fragments.[4] The second

[4] B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. The Amherst Papyri. Being an account of the Greek Papyri in the collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney at Didlington Hall, Norfolk. Part I: The Ascension of Isaiah, and other theological fragments. 4to, Boards, pp. iv, 48. With 9 Plates. 1900. 15*s*.

volume of the Amherst Papyri will contain the classical and non-literary documents in the collection, and is expected to appear during the course of the present year.

Dr. M. Peritz has furnished a contribution to the study of the early translations of parts of the Old Testament by publishing the Arabic text of two versions of the Book of Ruth, one from MSS. at Oxford and Berlin, and the other from a single MS. in the British Museum. The author has added critical and exegetical notes, and in some cases a German translation. If one or both of the translations have not been written by Saadyah, they were at least published under his influence. Another Arabic translation of part of the Old Testament, Lev. 1 : 11 to Deut. 28 : 68, we owe to Dr. J. Hirsch; it is taken from a MS., formerly in the private collection of Dr. A. Jellinck, and now the property of the Jewish Seminary at Vienna. Dr. Hirsch believes that the MS. was written between the time of Saadyah and the author of the so-called *Pentateuchus Mosis*. Students of early Hebrew philology will find abundant material of analysis in the numerous interpolations and glosses added to the text by later hands.[5]—Dr. S. Bernfeld has published 126 pages containing a description of the Talmud under four sections: Oral tradition, Talmud or Gemara, historical development, and outside events. The book forms a clear and interesting introduction to the study of the subject.—In 1895 Dr. Budge published among his Oriental texts bearing on St. Michael the Archangel a homily on the conversion of an Indian king to Christianity, attributed to Severus, the Archbishop of Antioch, and written in three languages, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic. Now Prof. Pereira has prepared and published a Portuguese translation of the Ethiopic text, together with a number of interesting notes on the authorship of Severus and the historical value of the homily. It cannot be proved that the story is of Hindoo origin, and has migrated from India into the Christian West.[6]—Miss M. A. Murray has compiled a useful little *Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities* in the National Museum of Antiquities in Edinburgh, which has

[5] Fragment einer arab. Pentateuch-Uebersetzung. Hrsg. und eingeleitet v. J. Hirsch. 8vo, pp. xxxvii, 79. Leipzig, 1900. 4*s*.

[6] F. M. Esteves Pereira, Conversão de um Rei da India ao Christianismo. Homilia do Archanjo S. Michael por Severo, Arcebispo de Antiochia. 8vo, pp. 61. Lisboa. 1900.

been printed by the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. The catalogue will prove of service, not only to visitors of the National Museum, but also to Egyptologists, as it affords them a careful list of what the collection contains.—Jewish and Christian scholars are interested in the rediscovery of the oldest Hebrew book of magic in existence, the MS. of which was lost over a thousand years ago. Dr. Gaster gave an account of the manuscript and the history of *The Wisdom of the Chaldeans*, at a meeting of the London Society of Biblical Archæology, and stated that he had come into the possession of his treasure from Nisibis in Mesopotamia. It consists of sixty-two leaves, written by at least two hands, some of it in Arabic with Hebrew characters, and proves to be a collection of magical formulas and recipes belonging to many ages.—Old Testament students will be interested also in Ed. König's lecture on the psychological state of the prophets,[7] in B. Neteler's translation and explanation of the Book of Judges,[8] and in B. Niese's critical work on the two Books of the Machabees.[9]

In the field of New Testament study, Mr. Walter Lowrie, M.A., has presented us with an interesting study on the Fourth Gospel.[10] He starts with a description of Biblical Theology, assigning it a middle place between pure exegesis and systematic theology: it differs from the latter, because it clings very closely to the form of Biblical conceptions, and it differs from mere exegesis, because it propounds Biblical conceptions in the terms of a system. If we keep in mind the fact that even under inspiration different writers may express the same idea in different terms, and various ideas in the same terms; that, moreover, individual authors may distribute the same Apostolic doctrine in different ways, and with peculiar emphasis, we shall find no difficulty in understanding the meaning of such phrases as "Biblical Theology," or "The Theology of St. John." Though Mr. Lowrie has produced a

[7] Das Berufsbewusstsein der alttestamentlichen Propheten. Vortrag. Barmen. 1900.

[8] Das Buch der Richter der Vulgata und des hebräischen Textes, übersetzt und erklärt. 8vo, pp. i, 134. Münster. 1900.

[9] Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher. Nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung. 8vo, pp. iv, 114. Berlin. 1900.

[10] The Doctrine of St. John. An Essay in Biblical Theology. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co.

painstaking and conscientious piece of work, he is not in a position to do full justice to his subject. Besides, the body of his book does not fully satisfy the promise of clearness contained in the opening pages. But, in spite of these and other drawbacks, the work is well worth reading.

Dr. Karl Joseph Müller has published a commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians in a most satisfactory form.[11] At first sight one may be astonished at a commentary of more than three hundred pages on a short epistle of four chapters. But the author has not been contented with a mere philological explanation of his text, nor with a mere enumeration of antiquated opinions on the more difficult passages; he professes to set the whole epistle in its proper historical framework, to state not only the thoughts of the Apostle, but also their occasion, their development, their entire bearing on the whole Theology of St. Paul. It is quite impossible to find a book that will satisfy all its readers; but we believe that many readers will be pleased with Dr. Müller's commentary. We must mention here also a pamphlet treating of the more recent investigation on the beginning of the episcopacy, compiled by Stanislaus v. Dunin-Borkowski.[12] Though the main sources of such an investigation are the epistles of St. Clement, St. Polycarp, and St. Ignatius, together with the Pastor of Hermas and the Teaching of the Apostles, still the Book of Acts and the Epistles of the New Testament are in many ways most vitally connected with the question, and therefore the foregoing monograph will be of interest even to Bible students.

[11] Des Apostels Paulus Brief an die Philipper. Uebersetzt und erklärt von Dr. theol. Karl Joseph Müller, Professor, Geistl. Rath in Breslau. 8vo, pp. viii, 348; Freiburg: Herder. 1899.

[12] Die neueren Forschungen über die Anfänge des Episkopats. Freiburg: Herder. 1900.

Book Review.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE at the Close of the Middle Ages. By Johannes Janssen. Vols. III and IV. Translated from the German by A. M. Christie. St. Louis: B. Herder. 1900. Pp. 370; 369.

The work of Johannes Janssen is well known to students of history, and we have had occasion, since the establishment of the REVIEW, to comment upon the excellence of the later volumes of the original, as they came from the press under the editorship of the author's able pupil and literary legatee, Professor Ludwig Pastor. Translations of the work were begun, immediately after the issue of the second volume, in French, Italian, and in English. The first instalment of the English version appeared about four years ago. The title-page bore the names of two translators, but the contents required only a cursory examination to convince the reader that the translators were not entirely masters of the German idiom. The actual mistranslations were of comparatively small importance; and whilst we pointed out this defect at the time we were disinclined to make much of it from fear of injuring the sale of a book which had its value as an important chapter in the history of facts, despite the accidental mutilation of forms.

In the two volumes just issued, however, a new and more serious fault makes its appearance. The incapacity of the translator (one of the translators discontinues) is supplemented by an evident bias, which reveals the bigotry of Protestant presentation.

A discordant note at once strikes the Catholic ear when we read, as has already been noted by several of our leading reviewers, that "Julius II had *proclaimed a sale* of indulgences" (p. 78); or, "Leo X *renewed the sale* in 1514, in order to raise money" (*ibid.*). The Fuggers "were now referred to the Pope's dealers for repayment out of the *proceeds of the sale of indulgences*" (p. 79). Tetzel is called a subcommissioner in Upper Germany "to carry on the *sale of indulgences* established by Leo X" (p. 90). These expressions are not found in the original, which speaks of the announcing (*ausschreiben* or *verkündigen*) of indulgences (Vol. II, p. 64), and of proceeds (*Einkünfte*) from the alms offered on occasion of the indulgences. Nowhere is there mention of the Popes ordering their sale. It is true

that the abuses of the indulgence-announcement by individual preachers here and there amounted to a mere traffic in spiritual things. That, however, is a very different thing from implying that the Popes proclaimed such abuses as the doctrine and practice of the Church. The author himself draws very clearly the distinction when he says, speaking of the sermons of Tetzel, "the erroneous views still current concerning these sermons on the sale of indulgences spring chiefly from the reason that things of a very different nature have not been carefully enough distinguished." And further on he says: "Tetzel's teaching was thoroughly irreproachable; and the statement that he sold pardon from sin for the sake of gain, without requiring penitence, has no foundation in fact." This is a sample of what recurs in various ways to show the predisposition of the translator. There are also inaccuracies which we need not point out, since our purpose is rather to show the untrustworthiness of the medium used to bring before the English-speaking public a work of such genuine importance as this *History of the German People*—all the more important as forming so large a chapter in the history of the Church and the Lutheran secession.

Naturally the reader is puzzled over all this, especially when he recalls the imprint of Benjamin Herder, a firm so long established in Europe and so entirely identified with a high-minded guardianship of Catholic interests in the field of literature, that its name should be above suspicion. The riddle, however, is solved when we learn that the English translation was entrusted to a Protestant firm in England, under whose direction the version was made and then issued as a reprint by the American branch of the Herder house. We say that the English version has been made under Protestant auspices, for although Mr. Kegan Paul, of the Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Company, is understood to be a convert to the Catholic faith, it remains a fact that the publications bearing their imprint do not consistently exhibit that discriminating influence which would eliminate what is justly offensive to Catholics. Of course Messrs. Trench, Trübner and Company have their right to appeal to a general public, including Catholics, and the association of a Catholic member with their firm gives the purchaser no pledge that such member can direct the investments and business policy of the house. But when these publishers assume the responsibility of issuing a Catholic work, and above all a mere translation, then it is nothing short of effrontery to author and to readers to allow such a work to be mutilated in the

interest of anti-Catholic prejudice. This, as we have said, has been done in the present instance. The translator, A. M. Christie, whatever glibness of pen she (possibly he) may possess, demonstrates a bias which adds a sneer to the whole work, whilst it escapes detailed criticism.

The American representative of Herder informs us that their firm is not responsible for the mutilation of the English translation ; and that he has written to the home office in Europe to protest, and to ask a correction of the offensive expressions which are a libel against Professor Janssen and the truth which he represents in his work. However free from blame in this matter the St. Louis house of Herder may be in their sponsorship for English versions published in London, it is difficult to exonerate from blame the present responsible head of the Freiburg establishment. The translation of Janssen with Protestant bias is not the first instance in which we have missed of late years the mature judgment and instinctive orthodoxy of Benjamin Herder, whose name stood for everything sincere and respected in Catholic letters, and whose genial home was for more than fifty years the meeting-place of the truest and greatest among Germany's Catholic scholars. Since the death of this Christian Mæcenas there have appeared under the Herder imprint several works, such as, to cite but one instance, the *Autobiography of Madame Guyon*, by Thomas Taylor Allen, which, we are sure, would not have passed his scrutinizing censorship, and which we deemed it charitable to pass over without comment among our *Books Received.* Such works betoken a wave of religious liberalism which is unwholesome and dishonors the principle of Catholic loyalty.

Enough has been said to guard the Catholic reader against this feature of a work which is in every other respect admirable. Janssen, as we have pointed out in reviews of the German editions, presents the objective truth of history in documentary evidence. If he shocks the timid mind by the unvarnished exposure of degradation within and without the Church before and during the latter Middle Ages, he at the same time demonstrates the unchangeable truth of Catholic teaching and the maintenance of a high morality as the result of strict adherence to that teaching. As Paradise was accessible to corruption and to selfish motives, so is the pale of the Church ; but as in the one was to be found the tree of life and happiness, so in the other is to be found the standard of truth and virtue, and abiding peace.

The two volumes before us cover the ground of the second volume

of the German. They deal with the history of the earlier humanists, and their relation to the scholastics. Here we obtain a good insight into the character of Erasmus, and his attitude towards the melancholy social product which grew out of the mixture of Christian truth and pagan philosophy. But by far the most important feature of the two volumes is the picture of Luther drawn from real life and from the testimony of his contemporaries. Luther's boyhood, his student years, his cloister life, his visit to Rome, and the subsequent conflicts, are here set forth without bias or exaggeration. The years 1521–1524, and down to the outbreak of the social Revolution, are filled with momentous events the motives of which can be clearly discovered under the light of facts given by Janssen. Luther's teaching, his methods in polemical discussion, his activity among the people and his pleas with the leaders in the State as well as in the Church, give us the key to the analysis of the unexpected consequences in the politico-religious and social life of Germany for which the so-called reformer is made responsible. The student of history and political economy will get from the perusal of these two volumes an excellent estimate of the inheritance which Protestantism has bequeathed to posterity by substituting the principles of the Reformation for the authority of the Church. That inheritance means in its last result State autocracy and spiritual anarchism.

The volumes are well printed.

SECOND OFFICIAL CATALOGUE OF CHURCH MUSIC examined by the Cincinnati Diocesan Commission on Church Music. Cincinnati, Ohio: Press of Keating and Company. 1900. Pp. 89.

In the midsummer of 1899 the Archbishop of Cincinnati issued a Pastoral Letter by which the clergy, diocesan and regular, of the archdiocese were enjoined, on and after the First Sunday of Advent, December 3, 1899, to use no other music in liturgical services except such as is contained in the approved liturgical books of the Church, or is given as accepted by the Cincinnati Commission on Church Music, "in this or in future Reports." It was a decided step towards purifying the musical atmosphere of our church services. The Commission did not pretend to be infallible, and declared at the outset its readiness to accept and utilize suggestions. But it eliminated with Teutonic decision whatever recalled the opera or the ball-room; and the concert singers who found their way into the choirs of the

Cincinnati churches began to miss the familiar scores that allowed them to practise the range of their voices in certain selections that had to do service in other places. Even those of us who are only a little less Cecilian than our brethren of the Ratisbon and Milwaukee schools felt a sort of heartache to see such gems as Donizetti's *Ecce Panis* in G placed on this Cincinnati Index, because it had been composed originally for the opera *La Favorita*. And how hard to see "Rejected" behind Verdi's *Jesu Dei Vivi*, because the cruel Attila had been the first possessor of its sweet melody! But they had to yield to the principle, and we cannot blame the Commissioners for their impartiality.

The present catalogue contains some additional "Rejected" pieces; but it also considerably increases the list of available music for the choir. And what is most noteworthy—a number of composers censured by the exclusion of their works from the Church service in the former catalogue have altered their scores and words so as to come within the lines of proper liturgical music. This is a distinct gain, which makes the approbation that has been given the work of the Cincinnati Commission from Rome, well deserved.

HISTORY OF AMERICA BEFORE COLUMBUS. According to Documents and Approved Authors. By P. De Roo. Vol. I, American Aborigines; Vol. II, European Immigrants. Pp. xxxiii-612; 613 Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1900.

Readers of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW are already familiar with Father De Roo's studies of the Pre-Columbian history of America from a number of articles which appeared on the subject in our pages, and which have found their place in these two portly volumes. The author was first led into research on this subject through the endeavor, while in Rome, to obtain some reliable information regarding Alexander VI. The Vatican Secret Archives are open to any qualified scholar, and whilst engaged in studying them our author came upon indications which made him suspect that they contained some hitherto unused material regarding the missionary history of America shortly before the Spanish discovery. What he learned of Christianity in America shortly before Columbus, set him on the track of an evangelization earlier than that to which his first documents had reference. There were numerous vestiges of Christianity, antedating even that of the much discussed Northmen. As some historians had found, or created, a pre-Adamite race, Father De Roo thought it his duty to go

back as far as possible in the region of historic tradition, and to gather the threads which might be woven into some reliable and connected history of the aborigines of our continent. Thus his material, which had in the first place been collected with a view to establishing certain missionary data that might prove valuable for a Church history, grew to include the social, civil, and political interests of the inhabitants of America in successive ages. Whilst therefore the religious trend of Father De Roo's investigations is at once apparent to the reader, his work serves as an unbiassed guide to the secular student of American history so far as it is devoid of any Catholic apologetic tendency.

It is needless to say that the author has utilized the ascertained facts and authoritative views of writers who have labored in the same field before him. The list of printed works referred to by him covers more than a dozen pages. Among the principal archives and manuscripts consulted by him are in the first place the Secret Archives of the Vatican which contain numberless *Regesta*, *Obligationes*, *Provisiones* and the Consistorial *Acta* referring to the pontificates of Innocent III, John XXI, Gregory XI, Nicholas IV and V, Clement VII, John XXII, Eugene IV, Calixtus III, Pius II, Paul II, Martin V. Next he searched the Consistorial Archives, the Lateran Archives containing *Regesta*, principally of Boniface IX, the libraries of the Barberini and Corsini palaces rich in codices, and others.

It would lead us altogether too far to discuss the merits even in outline of the various theories which the author examines, and those to which he inclines regarding the origin of the American man. As might be supposed, he had no sympathy with the pre-Adamite hypothesis drawn in the main from an erroneous interpretation of the Scripture reference to Cain. No more does he admit any Darwinian descendance or improvement theory. But he finds numerous traditions gleaned from the monuments and the language of the early Indians to lead to the supposition that near descendants of the patriarch Noah landed in America, after sailing in an easterly direction, by Behring Strait, or coming through Polynesia to the western coast of Central America and Peru. The subsequent history, especially the tracing of the influence of the Jewish patriarchal and Mosaic civilization, and later the Christian religion, introduced, as Father De Roo believes, by the very disciples of the Apostolic age, makes exceedingly interesting reading. Even if we do not accept as conclusive all the author's arguments from analogy regarding the

evangelization of the southern Indian races, the student can hardly fail to experience the fascination of this kind of research, and we can readily understand how, in the case of a priest like Father De Roo, this labor of collecting data, amid his missionary work in Oregon, has proved a *labor ipse voluptas*. The numerous sources and references give one a sort of security that it is not mere fable which he is reading, and there is that serene atmosphere of the Christian scholar which lights up the whole work and makes it so much more healthy and agreeable reading than the works of Prescott and others who found it necessary to interweave their personal or class prejudices into the story of early American history.

The volumes should be in every Catholic library. They are magnificently printed, containing choice maps and charts illustrating the scientific features of the work.

FOUNDATIONS OF KNOWLEDGE. In Three Parts. By Alexander Thomas Ormond, McCosh Professor of Philosophy in Princeton University. London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1900. Pp. xxvii–528.

The author of this work is successor in the chair of philosophy at Princeton to the late veteran philosopher, Dr. McCosh. The writings of Dr. McCosh are marked by a healthy philosophical temper, clarity in exposition, and a fair showing of erudition. As regards the first of these qualities the present work of Professor Ormond is worthy of him to whom as "beloved teacher and friend" he has "reverently inscribed" the volume. For, like that of the master, his philosophical standpoint appears to be that of a critical idealism, or, viewed from the other side, a temperate realism,—a position which avoids the extremes of ultra idealism and naïve realism. In respect to the second quality, clarity of exposition, the disciple has not followed so closely the example of the teacher. Professor Ormond has written some things that are by no means easy of understanding. Were it not ungracious, we might cite some passages in confirmation of this statement. It will suffice, however, to warn the "general reader" that the book is not for him, unless, indeed, he be willing to gird himself for very strenuous mental exertion. But to the reader who is determined to give some strained attention to its study, to the professor, therefore, and the professional student of philosophy, the work may well be recommended, and precisely for the reason that it so imperiously demands vigorous thinking on problems of supreme interest. Such

readers being, it may be fairly supposed, somewhat familiar with the terminology of Kantian and post-Kantian writings, either in the original or in translations, will not mind an occasional mistiness, seeing especially that goodly repetition throughout the text serves to make amends for some lack of perspicuity.

The three parts indicated in the title, into which the discussion falls, are the Ground-Concepts of Knowledge, the Evolution of the Categories of Knowledge, the Transcendent Factor in Knowledge. The keynote to the author's theme and its treatment lies in his conception of experience, which he thus defines: "The sum of those personal activities by means of which a conscious self reacts upon its object or not-self, and translates it into realized content, these activities being inclusive of thought, feeling, and will; or, objectively, the system in which these activities are included" (p. 50). Experience is thus taken, it will be noticed, in a far wider sense than usually falls to its lot in philosophy. It is wider, indeed, than knowledge, which is but "the product of one of the individual modes of experience" (p. 92). In sooth, it is an "all-comprehending term," extending to all reality.

The entire discussion embodied in the volume tends to the justification of two propositions: "The first is, that the world is through and through experience; and the second, that the world is through and through rational" (pp. 518, 519). The latter proposition "is only another way of saying that the world is through and through systematic" (p. 519). Both propositions reveal themselves to a thorough study of the space and time categories, the dynamic categories of cause and substance, the community or *socius* category, the æsthetic category of unity—all which "categories" the author has very subtily analyzed both in their subjective and objective phases, and in their development in consciousness. As regards the category of cause, we might here observe that the author seems to have unduly emphasized its volitional character, and thus narrowed its objective content. This is probably owing to some confusion between the subjective factor in the genesis of the notion of causality (the will) and the real definition of cause, apart from the manner in which the notion comes to be formed in our minds. Since knowledge is in the author's conception a more restricted term than experience, there can be factors transcending either term only when their content is limited to the actual and relative, but not when taken adequately as embracing the possible and the absolute.

The treatment of the subjects, absolute knowledge and experience, is also quite subtile. It could have gained not a little, both in matter and in form, by being brought into closer touch with what St. Thomas and his more recent followers have written *de divina scientia*. Indeed, it is a very great pity that Professor Ormond, and in fact almost all modern non-Catholic writers on philosophy, are seemingly so completely unaware of the existence of the Catholic literature on the subjects they take in hand to treat. Should there be a demand for a second edition of this work, its author in the preparation could not do better than consult Schmid's *Erkentnisslehre* (Herder, St. Louis, 1890, 2 vols.). We mention this work because of its full bibliography; though other works, like those of Balmes, Kleutgen, Liberatore, Regnon, Lorenz Fischer, Mercier, and the rest, might be equally helpful.

BRAIN IN RELATION TO MIND. By J. Sanderson Christison, M.D. Second edition. Chicago: The Meng Publishing Co. 1900. Pp. 142.

In this little volume will be found a succinct summary of what is best known and what is best to know concerning the relations between the brain and the mind. The structure and functions of brain cells, theories of sensory and motor centres and of cerebral localization, the relations of form and size of brain to the life of consciousness are passed in rapid review. The author has gathered the materials from his own medical experience, as well as from wide reading of recognized authorities on brain anatomy and physiology. He does not write with that parade of unexplaining technicalities and of "scientific" assurance one sometimes meets with in works of this class, but with the modesty that becomes the hiddenness and difficulty of the subject-matter. What is most commendable, he argues throughout against the materialism which would make the life of consciousness a "secretion" or a "function" of the brain.

LE P. GRATRY. Sa Vie et Ses ŒUVRES. Par S. Em. le Cardinal Perraud. Paris: Ancienne Maison Douniol. P. Téqui. 1900. Pp. x–354.

Father Gratry was one of those large-minded souls, or perhaps better, large-souled minds, which it seems the privilege of Catholic France to produce in every age. A brilliant writer, a scholar of many parts, a philosopher, an apologist, he was first and above all a saintly priest and a zealous apostle. No one living to-day is so capable of

telling the story of this remarkable man's life as Cardinal Perraud. Intimately associated with the illustrious Oratorian during the closing quarter of a century of his career—between the years 1847 and 1872—the Bishop of Autun enjoyed the exceptional advantage of knowing not only the surface history of Père Gratry's activity, but also the inmost life, the thoughts, the emotions, the aspirations, the trials and struggles of his soul. It is the laying bare of the deeper course and the *motif* of Father Gratry's life that gives the peculiar charm to this biography, a charm which is permitted to work its most potent influence on the reader's mind through the singularly chaste and graceful style in which the author has set it. Those who have derived their knowledge of the Oratorian's mind from text-books of philosophy or the manuals of the history of philosophy may probably associate with his system some phase of emotional mysticism. A study of the *Connaissance de l' Ame* and the *Connaissance de Dieu*, in the light of the biography before us, will be helpful in dispelling this error.

Besides, however, its æsthetic and knowledge value, the biography breathes a moral and religious power that must needs revive and extend the influence Père Gratry exerted on those with whom he lived, an influence which the love and admiration of the writer for one whom he delights to call *un guide*, *un père*, *un ami*, has further vivified by the touch of his own personality.

EDUCATION AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL IDEAL. By Horatio W. Dresser. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. v—255.

Mr. Dresser is deeply impressed with the fact that "the transition period in which we live is witnessing a noteworthy change of attitude in regard to that persistently fascinating thing which we call human life." He finds that "instead of the old theory of a divine providence and a disjointed world, torn asunder by a persistently threatening adversary, we now have as a practical faith the knowledge which modern science has so long and so nobly inculcated, the knowledge that the world-process is a unit" (p. 10). Various causes, he thinks, have contributed to this changed point of view. Amongst others, "Philosophy had long ago prepared the way for belief in this unity of the world-process." It was "modern science," however, "which supplied the evidence or proof, by showing that all forces are so many diverse forms of one ultimate energy" (p. 12).

The second great advance discerned by the author has been made

"through the discovery of the evolutionary origin of evil. What had before been either an absolute mystery or the subject to which theology claimed exclusive right," has now begun to be "very clear and to become generally understood. For when man's kinship with and indebtedness to the lower animals was established, it at once became evident whence came those tendencies and powers which had heretofore been deemed the outgrowths and penalties of original sin" (*ib.*). With this new insight into the mystery of evil, it is not surprising that "the very foundations on which the entire orthodox theological structure rested should be swept away. And, although many people do not yet realize it, there is not the slightest reason left for belief in either the fall of man or a propitiatory saviour" (p. 13). We forbear quoting the paragraph immediately following this extract. It is too shockingly blasphemous.

The author defines education to be "the recognition of and coöperation with the immanent Spirit, on all planes of existence, as it is revealed through the individual consciousness of man." When we seek further what it is he means by "the immanent Spirit," we are told to "understand clearly that the materialist, the idealist, the theologian, and the man of science *mean* one and the same Substance, the Spirit, the Life of all, whether they term it matter, Infinite Self, God, or force" (p. 169). This Being or Spirit forms, with the worlds of nature and of human society, the realm of mind and morals, and the commonwealth of individuals an organism—"one organic whole." God is therefore not self-sufficient. For "if he be self-adequate, why are we here; why is nature here; how happens it that nature and human society are purposive organisms? If the nature of God be fulfilled only through the organisms which reveal him, he is so far dependent upon them. If dependent, his organisms contribute somewhat to his life; if the organisms are dependent upon him, he contributes somewhat to them. Therefore, the relation between God and these organisms is similar to the relationship between the minor and major parts of an organism, although infinitely more complex than the relations of any organism commonly known to man" (p. 200).

The foregoing extracts will suffice to indicate the author's philosophical standpoint, which is in no wise saved from pantheism by his conception that the latter system supposes "a mere totality," an "absolutely identical whole without parts," whilst his own world-conception involves an "organic whole" with individual and social "organisms" as parts. It is, of course, well known to every one at all

acquainted with the history of human thought that such a view of the world and life is not any "revelation of modern science," but is merely a reiteration of the central doctrine of the Sankhya, Nyaya and the Vedanta schools of ancient India, as well as that of the Stoics and the Eleatics of pagan Greece.

LA CONSTITUTION DE L'UNIVERS et le Dogme de l'Eucharistie. Par le R. P. Leray, Sudiste. Paris: Librairie Ch. Poussielgue. 1900. Pp. 274.

A work to which an author of proved ability and learning has devoted two-score years of labor deserves the serious attention of students interested in its subject-matter. Such a work is the one here at hand, in which scientific and philosophical theory are utilized in the service of faith, and faith returns to shed light on the world of nature. It sets forth a scientifico-philosophic system which embraces the constitution of matter, the mineral, plant, animal, and man, these departments of nature being analyzed somewhat in detail. The teaching of faith on the Blessed Sacrament is explained, and the author's theory as to the constitution of elementary matter applied to the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, and Holy Communion, not, of course, with the attempt to explain away these mysteries, but to show the conformance of reason and faith, and how these two organs are mutually supplemental in this the most transcendent sphere of the supernatural.

Father Leray has thought out a theory of nature which is in several respects original. Agreeing in some points, it differs in others from the familiar system based on "matter and form" taught generally in the schools.

A summary of it would not fit into the space here at command. Suffice it to notice one or two of its characteristic features. Space—*real* space—the author claims to be a real substance; essentially passive, however,—activity not being of the definition of substance. Whilst this spatial substance is infinitely divisible, material substance existing in space is made up of simple elements or atoms. The atom is made up of real space and a monad, as man is composed of body and soul; and the monad is present to the entire volume of space, as the soul is present to the entire body. In both cases there is a presence of action. As soul communicates life to the body, so does the monad communicate impenetrability to the space which it occupies. The mineral world is composed of chemical elements, molecules, and masses. An element of a chemically simple body, that is, a *chemical*

atom, is a group of atoms of ether controlled by a monad whose shape and volume are unalterable. Besides the subtle ether, the author postulates the existence of a still more tenuous medium, which he calls *eon*, the ether atom being then resoluble into a group of atoms of *eon*. It would be interesting to show how this ingenious theory of atomic composition is adapted to transubstantiation and to the Real Presence, but it would carry us too far afield.

One may not ascribe to the theory, but as to the manner in which it is developed and illustrated there can be no question. Seldom even in French does one meet with so thoroughly perspicuous a treatise. There is not the slightest obscurity in the thought or style. It flows along smoothly, reflecting depths whose measure it conceals. Besides the main subject, the volume contains several very interesting papers on transformism, memoirs presented at the International Scientific Congresses of Catholics held in 1891 and 1894.

THE GOLDEN LEGEND; or, Lives of the Saints, as Englished by William Caxton. Edited by F. S. Ellis. Vols. VI and VII. Pp. 274; 291. (The Temple Classics.) London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1900.

"Thus endeth the legend named in Latin Legenda Aurea, that is to say in English, the Golden Legend. For like as gold passeth in value all other metals, so this legend exceedeth all other books, wherein be contained all the high and great feasts of our Lord, the feasts of our Blessed Lady, the lives, passions, and miracles of many other saints, and other histories and acts, as all along here afore is made mention." Besides this quaint summary given by William himself, the last casket of these antiquely wrought gems includes some jewels pertaining to the Holy Mass, worked especially for the edification and instruction of the celebrant. A general index to the seven dainty volumes is a welcome feature of this Temple Classics edition.

LA CONSCIENCE DU LIBRE ARBITRE. Par Léon Noël, Agrégé de Philosophie de l'École St. Thomas d'Aquin, à l'Université catholique de Louvain. Paris: P. Lethielleux. Pp. vii—286.

No other problem, unless it be that of certitude, has occupied so large a part in recent philosophical discussion as that of the will's freedom. This fact, apart from its many-sided importance, will account for the multiplication of works, defensive and aggressive, bearing on the subject. The present little treatise deserves a place of honor along-

side the more extended works of Gutberlet, Fonsegrive, and Piat. The author has converged his forces on one point, the argument for liberty based on consciousness. He first explains the theories of Kant, and with more detail those of recent determinists and undeterminists. The positive argument is then fully analyzed, cleared of some encompassing obscurities, and ably defended. Lastly, the roots of liberty are sought in the intellectual power and spiritual nature of the soul—the well-known *a priori* argument for freedom. The constructive features of the work are solid, the critical just and comprehensive, and the literary attractive.

THE NEW RACCOLTA; or, Collection of Prayers and Good Works to which the Sovereign Pontiffs have attached Holy Indulgences. Published by order of His Holiness, Leo XIII. From the Third Italian Edition, authorized and approved by the S. Cong. of Indulgences. Philadelphia, Pa.: Peter F. Cunningham & Son. 1900. Pp. 684.

This *New Raccolta* comes in good season, at the moment when the extension of the Jubilee Indulgence is announced; for although the latter abrogates the main concessions of particular and local indulgences in order that all the faithful may the more readily avail themselves of the opportunities afforded by the Jubilee privileges, the power of applying ordinary indulgences to the souls in purgatory remains intact.

The translation of the *New Raccolta* is made from the latest authentic edition of the Roman *Raccolta*, published in 1898, and is in all respects a faithful version of the original. Although the volume contains a large amount of matter in addition to the contents of former editions, the publishers have managed, by a judicious choice of type and paper, to keep the bulk and size of the work within such limits as to make it serviceable as a handy prayer-book. With this view they have also added an Appendix containing approved prayers for Mass and the Vesper services of Sundays.

The clergy will readily understand the particular advantage of possessing this collection of prayers and devotions having the full approval of the Holy See and enriched in every case with authentic indulgences.

Recent Popular Books.[1]

ACCORDING TO PLATO: F. Frankfort Moore. $1.50.

A pretty English girl secretly engages herself to a man, but at the moment when he has made political arrangements by which he hopes to force her ambitious father to consent to their marriage, she changes her mind and endeavors to break her pledge. He refuses to release her, and, buying her father's consent, publishes an announcement of betrothal, whereupon she apprises him of a second young man, and one of her father's friends shows him that it is best for him to consent. The second heroine is an all too attractive person whose days pass in assuring young men that she has always regarded them as friends. The story is much lighter than most of its author's work.

ARCHITECTS OF ENGLISH LITERATURE: R. Farquharson Sharp. $2.00.

Twenty-four biographies of authors flourishing from the time of Chaucer to the death of Tennyson. Longfellow and Emerson are included in the list. The title is hardly descriptive, but the papers are good.

BIOGRAPHY OF A BABY: Millicent Washburn Shinn. $1.50.

The baby is studied from day to day, and almost from minute to minute, and the dawn of her perceptions is carefully noted. The observations are valuable and the author is an intelligent witness, but in her comments she sometimes forgets herself and credits the infant with faculties not developed in early youth, and often not developed at all. Miss Shinn has been interested in this matter for some years, and her book is the best of its class among those written by women, and is less intent upon the discovery of arboreal characteristics than most of those written by men.

COBBLER OF NIMES: M. Imlay Taylor. $1.25.

The author cleverly takes the middle path between the Catholic and the A. P. A., making all his young and handsome personages Huguenots, and giving his hunchback Catholic hero almost supernatural goodness. The romance is pretty in itself, and the convictions of no reader of average judgment will be disturbed by the casual remarks of the Huguenots, but it would be possible to give such an array of quotations as should make it seem really dangerous.

CONCERNING CHILDREN: Charlotte Perkins Gilman. $1.25.

A group of papers attacking certain weak points in popular theories as to the control and education of children, with suggestions in regard to private coöperation and public nurseries. The author constructs a very good case for common nurseries, but does not quite succeed in showing that the public nurse will certainly be more angelic than the mother, although she may be wiser. The coöperative plan is well thought out and arranged, but it presupposes six mothers of uncommon cleverness and good temper and in agreement in all essential points on the management of children, and it is seldom that a woman meets with five whom she regards as her peers in wisdom.

[1] This department is designed to furnish the Reverend Clergy with brief critical notices of the publications of the month likely to gain considerable circulation. Each book is judged from the moral and Catholic point of view, so far as that is necessary to warn the reader of any noxious tendency or of the usefulness of any newly published book.

The prices given are those for which the books will be sent by the publisher postpaid. The best booksellers in large cities grant a discount of twenty-five per cent. except on choice books, but the buyer pays express charges.

CONQUEST OF LONDON: Dorothea Gerard. $1.50.

Four impecunious sisters, surprised by receiving bequests of £1,000, visit London, spend the money in wild extravagance and soon find themselves poorer than ever. One marries imprudently, and one wisely, and in the end good provision is made for the other two, the author not being intent on preaching against lack of thrift. The vivacity of the girls is a little forced, and they seldom seem real.

CONSEQUENCES: Egerton Castle. $1.50.

The English hero, vexed by the childish levity of his pretty Spanish wife, pretends to commit suicide, but really goes to America, where he makes a fortune. Returning he finds his wife dead, their son a distinguished young soldier of admirable character, and his nephew amiably intent upon proving his son illegitimate, claiming his grandfather's estate and marrying a young woman beloved by both cousins. The father succeeds in defeating the plan for acquiring the estate, but the girl bestows her heart upon him, and as he does not desire the gift, he and his son go away together. The author's verbosity is amazing, and the villain is too melodramatic, but the plot is good.

DARLINGTONS: Elmore Elliott Peake. $1.50.

Darlington, the father, president of the railway company which has brought wealth to his town; Miss Darlington, auditor of the company; and young Darlington, traffic manager; and an aggressive Protestant minister are the chief characters. The morality of certain practices common to all railway corporations and the case of a man afflicted with periodical disposition to gross inebriety are the main lines of interest, but the incident, character, and touch of the book is without originality.

DAUNTLESS: Ewan Martin. $1.50.

The militant Bishop of Clogher is the hero's kinsman and, with Owen Roe, and Cromwell, frequently casts the fictitious characters into obscurity. The Protector plays the part of good fairy in the end, but is by no means whitewashed or made attractive; and if the author has not adhered to history with sufficient accuracy to satisfy Irishmen, he has made a story which will greatly enlighten most American and English novel-readers, and aid in giving Ireland romantic interest in their eyes.

DR. DALE: "Marion Harland" and Albert S. Terhune.

After enduring much from gossips and young women anxious to marry him, the hero commits suicide from motives intended to be regarded as lofty. The story is related with the touch of bitterness often seen in the elder author's work, and makes one sorry for the foolish whom she condemns.

DUKE: J. Storer Clouston. $1.50.

This story is one more variation of the tale of the colonial savage suddenly plunged into London polite society. Although really a duke, he permits a friend to assume his title, while he pretends to be a secretary, and from safe obscurity observes the men and women whom his newly inherited title makes his future associates. It is an amusing trifle.

ENGLISHWOMAN'S LOVE-LETTERS. $1.50.

This book is not to be confounded with "Love-Letters of a Musician," or with any of the recent volumes of very clever gossip on art, literature, music, and society arranged in letter form. The "Englishwoman" writes love-letters to the man upon whom she has bestowed her voluble unasked affection, but retains them unsent until he has declared himself her lover. Then she sends her previous letters to him, and discourses at large upon her feelings until she dies. He endures it for many score pages, and then, without giving any explanation, breaks their engagement of marriage, possibly, one surmises, to obtain time to eat and sleep between letters, but this merely changes the subject of her eloquence, from wonder that he should love her to inquiries why he loves no longer.

The author's model in style seems to be the epistolary literature of the divorce court. In character, the heroine is a mere repetition of the wearisome "Phantom Rickshaw" woman, but her temperament is Dutch rather than English.

FATE THE FIDDLER: Herbert C. MacIlwaine. $1.50.

Australian interests and industries of various kinds play a part in this story in which the hero and the villain begin as partners, continue as shearer and lamb, and end with the victim triumphantly rich and happy. It is a man's book, its entire interest depending upon matters having slight interest to women.

GRISELDA: Basil King. $1.25.

The hero, a Scottish peer, falls in love with a girl passing for an American heiress, but really owning the title which he wears, and intent upon claiming it. She loves him, but is firmly resolved to prove her mother's marriage, come what may. In the end, after no more tribulation than is good for them, the two are married. The story is written with too visible care, but is otherwise very good.

INN OF THE SILVER MOON: Herman Knickerbocker Viele. $1.25.

The two chief personages, meeting casually, pass through a series of absurd adventures, and end by his discovering that she is really the woman to whom his parents affianced him in babyhood. The story is written with a neatness seldom found in fiction not French.

LADY OF DREAMS: Una L. Silberrad. $1.50.

A doctor living and working in East London, marries a girl who, attempting to defend a female servant, has killed her crazy uncle. She afterwards falls in love with her husband's best friend, and kills herself in despair at her unfaithfulness, which is purely mental. The two men are characters worth describing, and the book would be very good had not the author chosen to encumber it with a mass of sordid detail far exceeding what might be necessary to form a dark background for the doctor's wonderful self-sacrifice. It is possible to be weary of feminine East London.

LEADING POINTS IN SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY: Edwin A. Pratt. $2.50.

A book of reference arranged as a diary with an index referring to dates, and comprising not only all the incidents of any consequence, but memorable phrases, in speeches and in negotiations. Its bias is English, but it is not violently partisan.

LETTERS OF THOMAS EDWARD BROWN: Introduction by Sidney T. Irwin. $4.00.

These epistles are such as a man of letters overflowing with good spirits might be expected to write to his peers and superiors, and they include much pleasant criticism, but the opinions of literature and art conveyed by a Protestant bachelor to his friends differ so widely from those entertained by Catholics, that in spite of geniality and a happy trick of style, the book cannot be recommended to any but mature readers. As a means of estimating the Oxford of the later nineteenth century it is valuable.

MY MOTHER'S JOURNAL: Katharine Hillard.

This account of five years spent in Manila, Macao, and South Africa, 1829–1834, is worth a glance, because of the evidence which it gives of the curious religious narrowness and intolerance of the American woman of the period, and of her perfect conviction that no foreign race, creed, or country could teach anything to the United States. The writer was an educated gentlewoman, and representative of the best American women of her time, but her illiberal temper could hardly be matched in her class to-day.

ONE OF OURSELVES: L. B. Walford. $1.50.

The villain and the hero are one in this story, which deals with a family regarding itself as the acme of every species of perfection until the sudden flight of one of its members, and the

discovery of his defalcations shakes the conviction. A second family group of three sisters ill contented with themselves and their fortunes contrasts with the first, and the double story is pleasantly written.

PARIS OF TO-DAY: Richard Whiteing. $5.00.

Fashion, the boulevards, sport, the official and artistic classes, the stage, the poor and the rich, in Paris become in turn the author's subjects, and he shows remarkable familiarity with all, and great fairness in treating them. He is not deluded by the loud wailings of the decadents, and, although anything rather than obtrusively pious, he does not fancy that incapacity for faith as proof of greatness of mind. The volume is profusely illustrated by M. Andre Castaigne.

SOULS IN PAWN: Margaret Blake Robinson. $1.25.

The author, who has in a former book described herself as a reporter converted by the late D. L. Moody, casually remarks that she hopes that everybody who reads her book will love the Lord Jesus better afterwards. It is so difficult to see the two acts in the relation of cause and effect, that one is driven to suppose that she merely trusts in constant automatic growth in grace. She describes the vagaries of a club composed of poor, ignorant girls, and conducted with complete disregard of all custom and usage; yet the story is not comic, but as serious as a president's message, and the author expresses a lively hope that her readers will love the founder of the club.

STORY OF THE SOLDIER: Gen. G. A. Forsyth. $1.50.

The soldier as he really is; the work which he has done as explorer, as guardian of the boundaries, and as preserver of municipal peace, and the manner in which he has been treated by Congress and by the people at large, are General Forsyth's themes. He writes with authority of long experience, and his words are brilliantly illustrated by Mr. Zogbaum.

TRANSIT OF CIVILIZATION FROM ENGLAND TO AMERICA IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY: Edward Eggleston. $1.50.

This volume is at least as interesting as any of the American historical novels, and heightens the value of all, describing the period which it treats. The vast extent of the knowledge acquired since the days of Mary II is much better appreciated by a young reader after perusing this work. Mr. Eggleston is a Protestant, and now and then betrays his opinions by a chance epithet, but he apparently intends to be perfectly impartial.

WELLESLEY STORIES: Grace Louise Cook. $1.25.

A Massachusetts college for girls is the scene of these pieces of fictions which reveal the undergraduate's life as composed in nearly equal parts of strictly feminine quarrels and encounters, based upon imitation of the worst features of class politics as found in their brothers' colleges. The college is neither better nor worse than others of its species, but the writer's taste has guided her to choose unpleasant subjects.

WORKS OF EDWARD EVERETT HALE: Poems and Fancies. Vol. X. $1.50.

The poems are of the "occasional" species and were collected by the friends of the author. The exceptions are a few written to terminate sermons. The "fancies" are little plays, a translation of Aucassin and Nicolette, and some of the editorial articles written for *Old and New*, a magazine edited by Dr. Hale.

WORLDLINGS: Leonard Merrick. $1.50.

The chief character, being in the narrowest financial straits, presents himself in England as the son and heir of a wealthy baronet, the death of the real man, a self-exiled scapegrace, having been almost simultaneous with the arrival of a fatherly letter of reconciliation. The imposture is successful, but after making the father happy by three years of dutiful conduct, the deceiver falls in love, where-

upon the woman who suggested the scheme to him compels him to confess. The grateful father makes him an annual allowance and he marries happily.

WHO'S WHO 1901: Douglas Seaden. $1.75.

The fifty-third issue of this publication includes "Men and Women of the Time," and is about a sixth larger than its predecessors. Its special features are the alphabetical arrangement of its tabular matter, making reference very easy; and the authoritative nature of its biographies, which are for the most part composed of the answers sent by the subject to a list of printed questions. The disproportion between the careful volubility of the nobodies, and the reticence of many really great persons prevents the work from having any value as a means of comparative estimate, but it is a treasury of dates, lists of books written, battles fought, and discoveries made.

Books Received.[1]

A TREASURY OF IRISH POETRY In the English Tongue. Edited by Stopford A. Brooke and T. W. Rolleston. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co. 1900. Pp. xliii—576. Price, $1.75.

THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY. Ecclesiastical Register and Almanac. 1901. Sixty-fourth Annual Publication. London: Burns and Oates. Price, 2s. 1d.

THE ROSARY GUIDE. For Priests and People. By the Very Rev. Father J. Proctor, S.T.L., Provincial of the Dominicans in England. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.; New York: Benziger Bros. 1901. Pp. vii—284.

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE. Propositi et Soluti Romae, ad S. Appollinarem in Coetu S. Pauli Apostoli. 1899–1900. N. 5. Cura et expensis Rmi Dni Felicis Cadène. *Analecta Ecclesiastica.* Constat lib. 1.25.

L'IDÉE DU SACERDOCE ET DU SACRIFICE DE JÉSUS-CHRIST, par le R. P. de Condren, de l'Oratoire, avec des additions par un Père de la même congrégation. (Edition revue et augmentée par un bénédictin de la Congrégation de France.) Paris: Librairie Ch. Douniol, P. Téqui, libraire-éditeur, 29, rue de Tournon. 1901. Pp. liv—384. Prix, 3 fr. 50.

FUN AND FROLIC. Fourteen New Plays and Saynètes, for School Entertainments. By Frances Isabelle Kershaw. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Benziger Brothers. 1900. Pp. 128. Price, 80 cents.

[1] Books sent for review should be addressed to the Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Overbrook, Pa.